

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

Devoted to *Scientific Study* of Rural Life

VOLUME 7

SEPTEMBER, 1942

NUMBER 3

Rural Life Changes and the War, Bruce Ryan and C. Arnold Anderson

Field Research and Assimilation,

Nathan L. Whetten and Arnold W. Green

How Satisfying is Rural Life?.....Lowry Nelson and Edgar McVoy

Rural Housing in the South.....T. G. Standing

Agrarian Conflicts in New York.....Irving Mark

Selected Farmer Attitudes.....Alvin L. Bertrand

Culture Change in Southern Illinois.....Herbert Passin

Population Changes of Hamlets and Villages.....S. C. Ratcliffe

Notes—

The 1941 Extension Committee of the Rural Sociological Society, D. W. Buchanan, John Newton Baker, Margaret T. Cussler and Mary L. De Give, Robert A. Rohwer, Edgar Schmiedeler, Roy H. Holmes.

Current Bulletin Reviews.....Edited by Conrad Taeuber

Book Reviews.....Edited by Reed H. Bradford

News Notes and Announcements.....Edited by Robert A. Polson

Official Organ of the
RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

PUBLISHED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING
University of North Carolina

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

Published Quarterly

BOARD OF EDITORS

CARLE C. ZIMMERMAN, *Editor**.....Harvard University
CHARLES P. LOOMIS, *Acting Editor*..U. S. Department of Agriculture
C. HORACE HAMILTON, *Managing Editor*.....N. C. State College
LOWRY NELSON, *Associate Editor*.....University of Minnesota
T. J. WOOFER, JR., *Associate Editor*.....Federal Security Agency
DWIGHT SANDERSON, *Associate Editor*.....Cornell University
SELZ C. MAYO, *Assistant Managing Editor*.....N. C. State College

LIAISON EDITORS

REVEREND EDGAR SCHMIEDELER, *Liaison Editor for North American Cooperation*.....Catholic University of America
T. LYNN SMITH, *Liaison Editor for Latin-American Cooperation*,
Louisiana State University

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS

Book Reviews: REED H. BRADFORD, University of West Virginia
Current Bulletins: CONRAD TAEUBER, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
Research Notes: PAUL H. LANDIS, Washington State College
Society Notes: ROBERT A. POLSON, Cornell University

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

C. J. GALPIN, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, USDA	RUPERT B. VANCE, University of North Carolina
MANUEL GAMIO, Universidad Nacional de Mexico	GEORGE S. WEHRWEIN, University of Wisconsin
DOROTHY SWAINE THOMAS, University of California	M. L. WILSON, United States Department of Agriculture
B. YOUNGBLOOD, Office of Experiment Station, USDA	

SPONSOR

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

OFFICERS OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

President—C. E. LIVELY, University of Missouri
Vice-President—PAUL H. LANDIS, Washington State College
Secretary-Treasurer—ROBERT A. POLSON, Cornell University
Members of the Executive Committee:

T. LYNN SMITH, Louisiana State University
RAY E. WAKELY, Iowa State College

RURAL SOCIOLOGY is published by the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, in March, June, September, and December.

Membership dues in the society, including subscription, are \$3.00 per year; student members, \$2.00 per year. Subscription rates to non-members and libraries are \$3.00 per year. Single issues, 75 cents.

Manuscripts, communications for the editors, and business correspondence should be addressed to the Managing Editor, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina. Books for review, bulletins for review, research notes, and news notes should be sent directly to the appropriate departmental editor.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Raleigh, North Carolina, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1942, by the Rural Sociological Society

* On leave with the United States Army.



RURAL SOCIOLOGY

VOL. 7

SEPTEMBER, 1942

No. 3

CONTENTS

<i>Changes in Rural Life Growing Out of the War.</i> By Bruce Ryan and C. Arnold Anderson	239
<i>Field Research and the Concept of Assimilation.</i> By Nathan L. Whetten and Arnold W. Green	252
<i>How Satisfying is Rural Life?</i> By Lowry Nelson and Edgar McVoy	261
<i>The Problem of Rural Housing in the South.</i> By T. G. Standing ..	267
<i>Agrarian Conflicts in New York and the American Revolution.</i> By Irving Mark	275
<i>Selected Farmer Attitudes.</i> By Alvin L. Bertrand	294
<i>Culture Change in Southern Illinois.</i> By Herbert Passin	303
<i>Size as a Factor in Population Changes of Incorporated Hamlets and Villages, 1930-1940.</i> By S. C. Ratcliffe	318
<i>Notes.</i> Edited by Paul H. Landis	328
<i>Activities and Programs Being Carried on in the Field of Rural Sociology Extension.</i> By The 1941 Extension Committee of the Rural Sociological Society	328
<i>An Experiment in Community Education by Means of Films and Forums.</i> By D. W. Buchanan	332
<i>Panel Procedures in Rural Sociology.</i> By John Newton Baker	333
<i>The Innocent Eye.</i> By Margaret T. Cussler and Mary L. De Give	335
<i>On Family Size Farms.</i> By Robert A. Rohwer	337
<i>Rejoinder to Mr. Rohwer.</i> By Edgar Schmiedeler	338
<i>Farm-Urban Conflict in the Village.</i> By Roy H. Holmes	340
<i>Current Bulletin Reviews.</i> Edited by Conrad Taeuber	341
<i>Book Reviews.</i> Edited by Reed H. Bradford	350
<i>Black, Parity, Parity, Parity.</i> By Gunnar Lange	350
<i>McWilliams, Ill Fares the Land.</i> By E. D. Tetreau	352
<i>Peterson, Forward to the Land.</i> By Arthur Raper	353
<i>Haystead, Farm for Fortune and Vice Versa.</i> By Arthur Raper	353

Wertebaker, <i>The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization.</i> By Rupert B. Vance.....	354
Thomas, <i>Blue Ridge County.</i> By Otis Durant Duncan.....	355
Nixon, <i>Possum Trot.</i> By Otis Durant Duncan.....	355
Anderson, <i>Desert Saints: The Mormon Frontier in Utah.</i> By Harold Christensen	355
Sorensen, <i>A Little Lower Than the Angels.</i> By Howard R. Cottam....	356
Pryor, <i>And Never Yield.</i> By Howard R. Cottam.....	356
Ross, <i>Democracy's College, The Land-Grant Movement in the Forma- tive Stage.</i> By Paul H. Landis.....	357
Schatzmann, <i>The Country School.</i> By Lowry Nelson.....	357
Turner, <i>Case Studies of Consumer Cooperatives.</i> By Edmund DeS. Brunner	358
Fink, <i>The Field of Social Work.</i> By E. M. Sunley.....	358
Rawson, <i>New Hampshire Borns a Town.</i> By Mason T. Record.....	359
Boan, <i>A History of Poor Relief Legislation and Administration in Missouri.</i> By C. E. Lively.....	360
Phelan, <i>The I. L. O. and Reconstruction.</i> By Lowry Nelson.....	360
International Labour Office, <i>Wartime Developments in Government- Employer-Worker Collaboration.</i> By Lowry Nelson.....	360
Klingberg, <i>An Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina.</i> By Gordon W. Blackwell.....	361
Sutherland, <i>Color, Class, and Personality.</i> By Gordon W. Blackwell...	361
Rodgers, <i>Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages.</i> By Edgar Schmiedeler	362
Herskovits, <i>The Economic Life of Primitive Peoples.</i> By Nicholas Mirkowich	363
Pegg, <i>American Society and the Changing World.</i> By Reed H. Bradford	363
Southworth, <i>Vauxhall Gardens.</i> By Reed H. Bradford.....	363
U. S. Department of Agriculture, <i>Climate and Man.</i> By E. D. Tetreau	364
Sorokin, <i>Social and Cultural Dynamics.</i> By Rudolf Herberle.....	365
News Notes and Announcements. Edited by Robert A. Polson...	368

Changes In Rural Life Growing Out of the War*

By Bryce Ryan and C. Arnold Anderson†

ABSTRACT

An attempt is made to forecast effects of the war upon four aspects of rural life: 1) population trends and migration, 2) urbanization of rural culture, 3) community organization, 4) the role of agriculture among the great groups within the nation. War will depress rural fertility by virtue of mobilization, urban migration, urbanization of family attitudes. Migration will be more diffused than in 1917-18 and greater in volume. The prospects for post-war industrial conversion are favorable enough to anticipate a limited back-to-the-land movement. The rural community will temporarily be more integrated but the total effect of the war will be to increase secularization. We may anticipate some resurgence of nativistic nationalism, particularly in rural areas. Farmers as a national pressure group will find their recent favored status and subsidies threatened after the war. New welfare policies will probably favor the disadvantaged groups of farmers rather than commercialized farmers.

El intento de este papel esta hacer algunos pronosticos de los efectos de la guerra sobre cuatro aspectos de la vida rural: 1) las tendencias del poblacion y del migracion, 2) urbanizacion de la cultura rural, 3) organizacion de las comunidades, 4) la parte de agricultura entre los grupos grandes a dentro de la Nacion. La guerra bajaria la fertilidad rural por virtud de movilizacion, el migracion urbano, y por urbanizacion de las actitudes de las familias. El migracion sera mas difundido, cuando comparado a 1917-18, y mas grande en tomo. Las perspectivas para el conversion industrial en el periodo despues de la guerra son bastante favorable para esparar un movimiento "regresar al terrano" limitado. La comunidad rural sera, por un tiempo, mas integrada pero el efecto total de la guerra sera un secularizacion aumentado. Podemos esperar un resurreccion de nacionalismo nativo, particularmente en las areas rurales. Los labradores, cuando tomado como un grupo de presion, se encontraran sus situacion, favorable recientemente, y sus subsidios, en un posicion muy peligroso despues de la guerra. Es probable que el plan nuevo de accion de bienestar se miraria con favor sobre los grupos de los labardores desventajas en vez de el grupo de labradores commercial.

Reputable sociologists, like most other social scientists, are loath to engage in forecasts on the effect of war upon American social structure. In part they are deterred by the feeling that "this war is different," in part by an understandable professional intolerance of he who would be a prophet.¹ Neither of these points of view is quite valid if sociology aspires to the role of science. The first is

simply a failure to recognize a universality in social processes apart from specific content; the second is an underestimation of the predictive value residing in accepted principles combined with some knowledge of variable influences and trends. Reliability of forecast must inevitably be less in some spheres of action than in others; *e.g.*, the effects of war upon

* Journal Paper No. J.1043 of the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa. Project No. 795.

† Department of Sociology, Iowa State College.

¹Waller, in his treatment of the changes of attitudes during a war, has given a graphic description of the distaste for comparisons with previous wars. See Willard Waller, *War in the Twentieth Century*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1940.

class structure as compared with the effects on the birth rate. But the war crisis offers two obligations to the sociologist which he should not evade. There is first an opportunity to test his generalized knowledge against a concrete situation. The second obligation is imposed by the increasingly important role accorded the sociologist in policy determination, which clearly implies the estimation of future possibilities on a more substantial basis than lay opinion, utopian thinking, or literal application of previous sequences of events.

The importance of demonstrating the serviceability of sociological knowledge in practical action is emphasized by the indisputable fact that many problems with which policy must deal after the war were already in train before the war. The war will bring many issues to the surface, and there will be a tendency to regard them as war products of only temporary importance unless their deeper roots are revealed. While many of the events of wartime will be in the form of speeding up or retarding long-time trends, others will involve the aggravation of circumstances which normally might have escaped general recognition as problems. There will also be many reorientations of public opinion, as well as events purely dependent upon "chance."

Sociologists should be relatively free from that emasculating mood which labels this war as "unique" and thereby discourages the accumulation of scientific knowledge which is pertinent to policy formulation. While many of the characteristics of this

crisis are indeed new, we can apply our theories to forecast some of the emerging social configurations arising, provided certain assumptions are granted. In offering this partial analysis of the changes in American rural society dependent upon war circumstances, we choose to assume that the war will be won by the United Nations. Moreover we assume that this goal will not be achieved before the United States has experienced severe strains but that it will occur before our social structure is so wrenched that it becomes indeterminate in terms of present knowledge. Additional assumptions will be necessary in dealing with specific tendencies.

The following analysis falls into four parts. A description of (1) prospective changes in population is followed by (2) a study of the types of cultural diffusion created or accelerated by the war. The discussion of (3) changes in rural communities leads to (4) an attempt to evaluate the shifting role of agriculture in relation to other national groups.

I. Population Changes

Birthrates. The recent rapid decline in rural fertility will be accelerated by the war. The aggregate national margin of natural increase, which has become dependent upon the fertility of rural families, will be diminished. This will result directly from military mobilization itself as well as from new attitudes acquired through wider contacts.

The magnitude of the drop in births due to men entering the army

will depend upon the size of our army, the location of troops, and the duration of mobilization.² A large army will absorb husbands and create a sharp drop in the number of children in the higher birth orders. If a large part of the army remains in this country there will be more marriages and more conceptions during the war. An extended war will defer many marriages so long that their average fertility will be much below normal over the remaining span of married life. Since rural marriages are more fecund, the cumulative effect of all these influences may well be of greater magnitude than in a corresponding contingent of urban marriages.

And these results would persist long after the war due to the changes in family attitudes resulting from an unusually large number of urban contacts. While we will experience the usual post-war spurt of births as soldiers return and marry and husbands rejoin wives, the pre-war trend will be quickly resumed. In fact, we may anticipate that the negative slope of the fertility trend will be increased.³ Soldiers are disproportionately recruited from rural areas, especially our regions of highest fertility.⁴ Many of these soldiers will become converted to urban small-family attitudes and a large propor-

tion will learn contraceptive methods. Consequently we may expect that the war's effect upon the future birth rates of these men will be larger than for urban soldiers.

The greater volume of recruitment from the high fertility sections of our population will lead to postponement of more rural than urban marriages. The relative unavailability of jobs for rural women will mean that fewer rural couples will follow the precedent of urban couples in which the wife supports herself by a war job while her husband is in the army. There will be another slight depression upon the long-run trend in rural fertility arising from the fact that a larger percentage of the pre-war rural youth will be killed and crippled, since proportionately more soldiers are from rural areas.

The heavy migration to urban jobs, of which a large share will be undoubtedly permanent, will have cumulative effects on the birth rate through an alteration of the rural age structure. The selectivity of youthful migrants is enhanced, in-

²A convenient comparison of the effect of war upon population changes in different countries is given in M. Huber, *La Population de la France pendant la Guerre*, Yale, New Haven, 1931.

³See Huber, *op. cit.*, also J. W. Innes, *Class Fertility Trends in England and Wales, 1876-1934*. Princeton University Press, 1938.

⁴See the second and third reports of the Provost Marshal General of the United States to the Secretary of War. These volumes contain detailed tabulations of the number of troops inducted from each state in 1917-18. The table on page 459 of the second report can be summarized succinctly. Of the 14 states which had more than an average percentage of urban population only 1 contributed more than an average percentage of its registrants to the army. And 25 of the 26 states contributing more than an average percentage of registrants in the army were rural states. A summary of the evidence showing the physical superiority of rural recruits can be found in P. A. Sorokin and C. C. Zimmerman, *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*, chapter 5, N. Y., H. Holt, 1929.

creasing still further the relative importance of non-productive age-groups in rural society. Those who go to the city will adopt the city's pattern of family life.⁵ Those who return after the war to their native rural sections will then have urban notions about contraception, and they will have smaller completed families than if they had not sojourned in the city. Their new attitudes and practices will spread among their neighbors more readily than would be the case were these practices spread only by the more impersonal channels of magazines or mail order catalogs. The diffusion in this manner of many other elements of the urban standard of living will raise the margin below which people choose not to have children when they possess the means to reduce fertility. In this war besides a heavy flow of farm youth to cities we are decentralizing armament plants into wholly rural areas.⁶ The adoption of urban attitudes has therefore a double impulse.

There are, on the other hand, certain elements in the war situation which will stimulate a rise in rural fertility. During a war farmers experience a greater gain in prosperity

than any other large group. Although the long trend in rising scales of living has been accompanied by falling rates of reproduction, in the short run fertility of all groups is correlated positively with income fluctuations. We may therefore expect many farm families to have more children than they would have had if farm incomes remained depressed. It is the higher birth orders, among families already established, which are most strongly affected by these short-run fluctuations. A post-war depression would of course depress births in these families. But the new couples formed during the post-war rise in marriages will have a high fertility rate for a short time; first births follow quickly upon marriage. In the total result, however, these factors favorable to higher rural birth rates are outweighed by those inhibiting births.

Migration. The great shortage in wartime is labor. Having entered this war while there was a large unemployed reserve, the upswing in the movement of rural youth to cities has been more sluggish than it would have been otherwise, perhaps more so than in the last war. But there is every evidence that this tide has begun to swell.⁷ We are starting with a larger group of "stored up" rural youth than in 1917, youth who have remained partly employed on the farm because of urban depression. Some loss of this rural population

⁵W. S. Thompson's monograph on "Average Number of Children per Woman in Butler County, Ohio, 1930" shows (page 49) that the excess fertility of southern-born couples disappears above a certain wage level. In view of the upward mobility among rural migrants with increasing duration of urban residence, these data may be taken as indirect evidence on the question. See also, C. V. Kiser, "Birth Rates Among Rural Migrants in Cities," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 16: 369-81. 1938.

⁶See Tolan Committee on National Defense Migration, *Hearings*, Part 16, pp. 6544-73, 6576-6620, 1941.

⁷See H. B. Myers, "Defense Migration and the Labor Supply," *Jour. Amer. Stat. Assn.* 37: 69-76, 1942. The Tolan reports contain a great amount of data on this question.

may, therefore, be regarded as just "catching up."⁸ Yet a long war, with the seemingly unlimited demand for labor and manpower would be more effective than World War I as a transplanter of people from farm to city. There is, of course, a counter current to rural areas resulting from decentralized production of munitions.⁹ To this extent farm people need not move to cities in taking up industrial jobs. But this counter current is not to agricultural occupations, and in any case, the amount of decentralization can be easily exaggerated.

The directional pattern of migration during this war appears to be more diverse than in 1917. Industry has become more dispersed; more war plants are located in rural areas; and the number of major industries producing for war is greater. Industry is no longer something afar to the rural residents of the high fertility areas; the southwest, Appalachians, Ozarks, the intermountain basin, the plantations of the old South.¹⁰ Through the operation of the short distance principle of migration, the more scattered industries should draw out a larger proportion of rural people today. The systematic establishment of vocational training schools, benefiting from the C.C.C. and N.Y.A. experience, will aid many rural youth to shift from agricultural jobs.

⁸See B. L. Melvin, *Rural Youth on Relief*, Research Monograph XI, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, 1937.

⁹See the reports of the Tolan committee.

¹⁰See the references cited in footnote 6.

It is difficult to estimate the extent of the back-to-the-land movement which we should anticipate after the war, but a number of factors will be operative. We do not now have, as we did during and after the last war boom, a reservoir of recent immigrants to underbid the native rural laborers attracted to the cities by the war, discouraging them in urban occupations. Increased unionism may also block opportunities in urban occupations insofar as unions establish restrictive tactics and limit employment through high wage policies. Although unions have the effect of decreasing employment in exchange for maintaining wages, this effect should be less in magnitude than the competition of immigrants after the last war. The technological revolution in agriculture which will be speeded up during the war, provided agriculture receives adequate priorities, will result in a much less favorable market after this war for agricultural labor. At the same time, the fact that the level of skill of industrial workers will be higher in 1943 or 1944 than in 1919 may favor a more prompt adjustment to a post-war slump in industry, thus holding workers in the city. There is now more willingness by the government to assist industry and of industry to accept aid and control. The experience in fiscal, relief, and subsidy policies of the last 15 years should assist in cushioning the deflation process and minimize the magnitude of population shifts to be expected. After this war there will be a less insistent demand for the withdrawal of government controls over

industry than occurred in 1918.¹¹ We will profit both by our trend toward greater control and by the specific mechanisms set up during the war. If there is now a greater discrepancy in scales of living between cities and the more isolated rural areas than in 1918, the rural people moving to cities or army today may be less willing to return to those rural areas than were their parents.

We must also consider the possibility that federal agricultural policies will be changed in the next few years in the direction of offering more aid to the lower income farm families rather than subsidies to the highly commercialized families. In the short run this should slow down the migration by the members of less prosperous families and make such positions within agriculture appear more attractive. In the long run policies improving the position of low income farm families will increase the extent of their contacts with urbanizing influences and lead the young people of these families to be more mobile cityward.

The final outcome will largely depend upon our success in the translation of industry to a peace time basis. Failure in this operation will lead to an "escape to the land," probably toward less commercial areas. But the trends in industrial-governmental relationships during the past decade offer support for a far more favorable prognosis for industrial readjustment than would otherwise have

been possible. Our general conclusion is, therefore, that a smaller percentage of the urbanward migrants will return to farms than after the last war.

Urban-Rural Composition of the Population. The resultant forecast from the preceding discussion is that the percentage of the population which is urban will again increase in contrast to the slackening of the last census period. The more rapid decline in rural fertility, a relatively smaller return migration to rural areas after the war, and more governmental stimulus to industrial production indicate a definite increase in the share of the population living in cities five years after the war compared to five years before the war.

But the longer run picture is less clear. The spread of birth control to areas of large families and the draining off of a large part of the rural reservoirs of population work for a renewed decline in rural population.¹² If industrial production is kept at a moderately high level, given the universalization of birth control among city families, the urban population cannot replenish its numbers. This dilemma will undoubtedly bring increased attention to the formulation of a national population policy.

Health. War devitalizes populations through epidemics, overwork, venereal disease, and malnutrition. Our fortunate position away from the battlefield and our role as a food producing nation are favorable

¹¹G. B. Clarkson, *Industrial America in the World War*, ch. 3. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1923.

¹²National Resources Committee, *The Problems of a Changing Population*, 1938. Page 127 ff.

counterweighing conditions. The restrictions on installment buying and on the availability of durable consumer goods should enable us to divert an adequate share of family budgets for food.

There is a reasonable probability that farm people will come out of the war with a health position better than that before the war. Larger farm incomes, the garden and nutrition programs, and isolation from epidemics are favorable. Rural soldiers will learn better health and diet habits, and many of those who are not injured will be in better health than when they left home. We shall probably see a large program of physical rehabilitation for rejected draftees. The school lunch program is apparently to be expanded. Certainly public health programs will be introduced more rapidly in rural areas than before the war.

On the other hand the increase of venereal diseases among rural soldiers will be especially important in view of the present relatively low incidence of these diseases in rural areas. The whole population must get along with fewer doctors. More rural doctors are above the age limits being taken by the army but a larger percentage of them will die or become incapacitated by age.¹³ Since rural communities now have many fewer doctors in ratio to population, the loss of any sizeable percentage of these men will be more serious than an equal loss in cities. Finally, the aging

of the farm population due to declining birth rate, a heavy migration of youth, and a lower retirement rate of older farmers will favor an increase in the rural crude death rate.

Population Policy. It may be expected that the war will hasten the serious consideration of a population policy for the United States. The prominence of manpower questions in public discussions will increase the already growing sophistication of Americans about demographic facts and trends. There will be more acceptance of social welfare policies as a means to winning the war. Among administrators these policies are being reshaped in ways that can readily be given a population focus.¹⁴ The depressing effect of the war upon population growth will increase our readiness to consider policies deliberately oriented around questions of quantity and quality of population. A resurgence of "Nativism" after the war would certainly create more interest in this area of social action.

While we feel incapable of being more definite about the particular policies which will develop, we offer one comment upon the question as it relates to the farm population. There are two opposite views on the implications of population policies for farm people. One group regards the farmers, particularly the non-commercial ones, as a kind of hatchery or preserve in which the nation's children are spawned and which should therefore be quarantined against

¹³See the forthcoming studies by K. Mengelberg and the present authors and a similar study for Minnesota by Lowry Nelson.

¹⁴Alva Myrdal, *Nation and Family*, New York, Harpers, 1941, states this program effectively.

urban influences and standards of living. Another group of policy makers also recognizes the farmers' distinctive role in reproduction, but they believe that reproduction is a public service and that it can be assured by more subtle means than keeping potential parents in ignorance of birth control or reasonable comforts of living. We judge that the policies of the Farm Security Administration and the food-stamp and school lunch programs are likely to be expanded. These types of policies would be favored by the second group of advocates. This decision would be affected strongly by the particular form which a post-war nativistic, nationalistic movement would take, but it seems probable that the deep roots of the "American standard of living" preclude popular acceptance of the "rural hatchery" policy.

II. Cultural Diffusion and Urbanization

The widespread diffusion of urban family attitudes and practices is only one element in the broad secularizing influence which is being intensified by the war. The long-time convergence of rural and urban cultures is being accelerated also by the spread of new dietary customs, public health systems, and other social welfare plans.

There will be augmented contacts with urban life by rural people who become soldiers or armament workers and through the decentralization of war industries. The radio and the urban press are in themselves urban traits which are still being adopted at a rapid rate by farmers. They are of

special significance because they are also channels through which innumerable other urban attitudes and desires for urban traits are stimulated. The rising incomes of farmers during the war as well as increased identification with the nation will increase the speed of diffusion of these communication devices and subsequently of other city notions. The total character of the war together with the greater interest of farmers in foreign news will combine with the dramatic and critical urgency of the war to unify the activities and focus the attention of the whole society. Localism and traditionalism will give way measurably before the mass bombardment by war agencies and propaganda offices.

Rationality is the burden of innumerable pleas for greater aid to the war effort; more production, savings, better nutrition, post-war planning. The many influences making for greater social and economic literacy are supplemented by the commercialization of agriculture in the drive for higher production. The factory farm is favored by the new conditions and national and rural ideals become more accommodated to it under the spur of need. "Food will win the war" pushes "the family size farm" into the background as a goal in rural life.

One of the most discriminating indexes of the urban way of life is the number and variety of special interest groups. During the war farm women, like urban women, work for the Red Cross; they meet often with sewing clubs, garden clubs, nutrition classes, canning schools, and discus-

sion groups on the purpose of the war. Particularly significant is the fact that the outside world and the overhead national groups take the initiative in organizing rural people into these varied secondary groupings. It was the impetus of the last war which established the Farm Bureau in rural America, and this farmers' organization is one of the most powerful secularizing influences in rural society.

The promotion of bond sales is a particularly clear example of the rapid acquisition of a typically urban trait. In the last war rural sections were at first notably slow in meeting their bond quotas.¹⁵ This was rightly attributed to the previous rural preference for buying land and ignorance of the characteristics of liquid investments, as well as to the difficulties in mobilizing the sales organizations in farming communities. In the successive campaigns the farmers distinguished themselves by exceeding their quotas. At the present moment farm people are reported to be responding to appeals to buy war bonds more freely than urban groups. Many farm leaders are urging the investment of war profits in bonds rather than in bidding up land values. If this plea is heeded it will indicate a new economic wisdom among farmers as well as the further decay of the attitude that investment in land is the first charge on the farm income.

These changes are not reversals of trends, since the American farmer

has progressively become more urban in attitudes, behavior, and social structure. There will, of course, be a reciprocal effect of rural culture upon urban, especially through the heavy migration of rural youth. But the first effect will be the greater. The distinctive rural traits such as the strong family system and "roots in the soil" will fight delaying action but not an aggressive one.

There are, however, three conspicuous instances of the thrusting of traditional rural mores upon the whole nation. One of these operates during the war; the other two instances are part of the return to normalcy which follows the war.

(1) During the struggle there is a strident cry for more production and a demand for sacrifice. These are more easily attained and readily justified by appealing to latent rural traditions of hard work and simple living. Much of the ideology of America remains rural and Spartan under the surface. This is already evidenced by the extent to which expanding farm incomes are being saved and used to pay up debts rather than to increase consumption.

(2) After the last war prohibition of liquor, and in some states restrictions on sales of tobacco were instituted as legal and moral codes. Both cases were clear examples of an effort to buttress bucolic virtues in an urbanizing society.

(3) In the United States after the last war one of the strong motifs in "the return to normalcy" was a revival of nationalism. Almost universally rural people have been the up-

¹⁵C. Arnold Anderson and Bryce Ryan, *War Came to the Iowa Community*, Iowa Agr. Expt. Sta. Bull. P-36. 1942.

holders of traditionalism, conservatism, and provincialism.¹⁶ Rural Americans have been emotionally consistent in following the traditional demands for political and economic individualism as well as the nationalistic dogmas of isolationism by supporting tariffs and military neutrality. Such isolationism readily becomes fervent militarism in wartime. Emphasis upon national security can activate quite different attitudes depending upon the nature of the threat to security. American rural folk in both the last war and in this were more isolationist until the war began.¹⁷ This rural nationalism became more serious as it affected the peace making and the post-war policies. The doctrine of "America self-contained" may again find its most favorable reception in our rural sections. It is this complex cluster of attitudes which nurtures the fears and resistances to international planning and leagues of nations.

This provincialism also manifested itself internally. After the last war the Ku Klux Klan flourished. The movement was predominantly rural, and it was nativist, isolationist, Protestant.¹⁸ The persistence of this nativist provincialism surely is a partial explanation also of the fact that farmers more conspicuously than any

other large group voted against their own economic interests in supporting the tariff so doggedly.

Similar problems are probable after this world war. The degree of internationalism may well be greater than before but the complexity of the issues will also be more awesome. Increased mobility will mean new contacts with minority groups and create new problems in accommodation. The reactions recently of the middle western states to the proposed reception of Japanese citizens do not encourage optimism. The Negro-white tensions fostered by the expected waves of migration out of the south are not lessened by the probability that a larger proportion of the new urban workers will be "poor whites" than was the case before.

None of these dangers is peculiarly rural, but the root attitudes lie principally in rural, nativistic Americanism. It is easy to forget how virulent were the rural outrages and community conflicts during and after the last war.¹⁹ The fact that one of our opponents is of a different race tends to increase the threat of a revitalized rural nativism.

III. Rural Community Organization

Community integration and consensus increase in wartime. Although certain permanent elements of unity arise during the war and persist thereafter, many conditions develop which over a longer period produce new forms of differentiation and conflict.

The community in war succeeds in

¹⁶Sorokin and Zimmerman, *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology*. ch. 17.

¹⁷This is graphically described for the period before and during the last war in Mark Sullivan, *Our Times: Over Here 1914-1918*. N. Y., Scribners, 1933. For recent years the public opinion polls are useful; see *Public Opinion Quarterly* summaries of poll results.

¹⁸J. M. Mecklin, *The Ku Klux Klan*, N. Y., Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1924, especially ch. 5.

¹⁹Anderson and Ryan, *op. cit.*

eliciting vastly more participation in collective enterprises by families and groups. There are innumerable mass meetings and campaigns. Organization is necessary to meet bond quotas, to get Red Cross work completed, and to spread the new schemes for conservation and better production methods. The community sees itself in a new light. Responsibility for the war programs and the sacrifices is not a sum of separate tasks of different individuals but a corporate duty.²⁰

Plans for community councils were realized in innumerable localities during the last war. Wearying experience of confusion and inefficiency combined with a sense of urgency to spread this new principle of organization. Some of these councils proved to be permanent; today new ones are being established and old ones strengthened. Farmers will become increasingly identified with their trade centers through joint sharing and community action. The smaller size and greater prevalence of personal relations permit this *gemeinschaftlich* development to be more manifest in rural than in urban communities. Tire and gasoline rationing, if enforced for two or three years, will give many small centers a new lease on life for a time. Subsequent developments depend almost wholly upon the post-war availability of these two critical materials of travel.

Neighborhoods, real and artificial, are being revived. The necessity of conveying promptly war ideals and

production plans down into every household leads to the utilization of neighbors as mutual teachers and extension agents. Neighborhoods are logical units for calling women together for canning demonstrations or assembling men for filling out stock feeding budgets.²¹ This small unit of organization will be emphasized the more now that we have transportation shortages. From these meetings will flow at least temporarily a new appreciation of neighborhood relations, but one would not anticipate any permanent reversal of the breakdown of these groupings.

There is no doubt that less of the initiative for war programs in local areas is vested in local leaders than in 1917-18. The local community is today being more systematically regimented as well as stimulated by national agencies. The various agricultural action agencies are proving most convenient for this purpose.²² And representatives of several other federal bureaus are entering rural areas with programs and appeals. While the "level of organization" is now higher than in 1917, the process of integration and collective orientation to the national purposes does not appear to differ qualitatively from that in the last war.

²⁰Division of Field Studies and Training, Extension Service, U.S.D.A., Report of National Conference on Voluntary Local Leadership held March 19-21, 1942. Mimeographed.

²²Bryce Ryan, "Democratic Telesis and County Agriculture Planning," *Jour. Farm Econ.* 22: 691-700, 1940, evaluates the respective roles of the farmer and the expert in agricultural programs.

²¹Anderson and Ryan, *op. cit.*

While war enhances the organic unity of communities it also stimulates unprecedented segmentalization in organization and contacts. Outside agencies separately and bluntly intrude into the life of the community, sorting out those persons or families for whom a particular message or program is directed. Although new activities are a source of pride to the community, they create new special interest associations, Red Cross sewing circles, nutrition classes, Bundles for Britain, etc. This secularizing tendency is enhanced by wartime prosperity in agriculture and increased exposure to urban patterns.

Existing local leaders direct their abilities to new spheres of action and new leaders arise who are instructed in the tactics of organization and campaigning. These skills, essentially of a secularizing character, are not abandoned at the close of war, but persist, along with the stimulus to secondary group participation. Following World War I, the tactics of organizing, and the organizations themselves, were manifested in new rural interest and pressure groups such as the Farm Bureau. Thus the Farm Bureau came to represent only a segment of rural society because only part of the farm families had the attitudes and resources to follow up the experiences of wartime and to utilize extension service facilities through Farm Bureau participation.

Although many communities gained new unity through experiences during the last war, this was mainly a unity tending toward the *gesellschaftlich* type. Along with increas-

ing community self-consciousness, the war fostered the long existing trend making the rural community a cluster of groups as opposed to a unified *gemeinschaft*. This war will inevitably bring new evidences of organic unity, but it is reasonable to believe that in the long run these will be less persistent than the secularizing effects.

One of the most disastrous outgrowths of the last war was the land boom and its post-war consequences. Economists are apparently of varying opinions as to whether we may expect a similar sequence of events in the near future. If land inflation occurs, the extent of disorganization will be too dependent upon its extent and the character of amelioration to permit of much specificity in forecasting effects on rural social structure. We may be sure that any significant degree of land inflation will bring derangements in community membership and in institutional design, as well as increased vertical mobility. But the evidences are that these problems will be less violent than those incurred by the last post-war boom. If the war is followed by a fairly stable "prosperity," it is most probable that the rural community will carry on its march toward an urban mode of organization. On the other hand, if a serious economic deflation occurs there will be at least a temporary slackening in rural secularization.²³

²³E. de Brunner and I. Lorge, *Rural Trends in Depression Years*, Columbia Univ. Press, 1937, ch. 10. Also, M. Oyler, "Social and Economic Effects of Land Speculation on Farm Families in Central Kentucky." Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 300, 1930.

IV. Agriculture Among the Great Groups of the Nation

The discussion of population trends in the early part of this paper indicates that the rural part of our nation will become a smaller proportion of the total as a result of the influences of the war. The South as a section will gain relatively in numbers and importance, but political strength in the nation, so far as it reflects numbers, must continue shifting cityward yet awhile. Culturally, all rural areas are becoming more urban. This includes enlarging "humanitarian" emphasis as well as a maturing sophistication in pressure group tactics. In becoming more urban, rural communities are at the same time becoming more differentiated internally. All these trends will be favored by the war, despite temporary pauses in certain respects.

Political power and social status are not solely products of numbers. Farmers gained economic and political strength during the last war, but the deflation period found them ignored and impoverished. With the depression of the thirties agrarian values rose in esteem. Farmers were given economic aid beyond their numerical deserts, out of line with proportionate needs. This position has become entrenched behind fixed subsidies and bureaucratic vested interest. The present crisis is adding the usual war prosperity to continuing and even enlarging subsidies.

The next test of the farmers' strength and status will come in an-

other deflationary debacle or in a post-war economy wave when government expenses are being pared. Short of a complete rigidifying of the national economy through wholesale adoption of the subsidy policy and a freezing of the population into "estates," the farmers will face a crisis.

Their position will be challenged by direct attacks on their special subsidies.²⁴ More in line with national welfare will be the proposals to shift government subsidies to a new basis. Here is one point where the organization of agriculture into a pressure group of the more prosperous farmers must give way if broader policies are to have any success. In fact this well knit pressure group may split into factions contending for separate assistance unless new policies gain favorable attention in advance of that juncture. It is significant that some of the state units of the Farm Bureau have begun to develop and sponsor policies which can open these questions for more judicious reappraisal. The reviving prestige of the Farm Union under imaginative leadership and its collaboration with urban labor groups in discussion of policy may also foreshadow new kinds of policies. So also does the growing prestige of the Farm Security Administration reflect a potential re-

²⁴T. Lynn Smith and Ralph W. Roberts, "Sources and Distribution of the Farm Population in Relation to Farm Benefit Payments," *Jour. Farm Econ.*, 23: 607-18, 1941, demonstrate the inequities in present subsidy policies from a population standpoint.

orientation of governmental assistance toward an increase of opportunity for disadvantaged groups rather than existing pressure groups. Briefly stated, it is reasonable to expect that we will witness a turning of social welfare policies toward a con-

sideration of people rather than commodities or farms.²⁵

²⁵T. W. Schultz, "Economic Effects of Agricultural Programs," *Amer. Econ. Rev.*, Suppl., Feb. 1941, 127-54. Also, C. Arnold Anderson, "A Theory of Social Security: with Special Reference to the Significance of Government Programs for Rural Society," *Rural Sociology*, 4:399-413, 1939.

Field Research and the Concept of Assimilation

By Nathan L. Whetten and Arnold W. Green†

ABSTRACT

The concept of assimilation is one of the many in sociological literature that have never been tested rigorously in field research. This paper reports the testing of the assimilation concept in a study dealing with ethnic group relations in a rural area of Connecticut. There are so many qualifying factors that must be taken into account in any attempt to measure assimilation that the concept becomes too unprecise to be of value in scientific research. A few of these factors are: the class structure, rural-urban differences, and the heterogeneity of cultural values. Diversification is so great along some of these lines that it is impossible to recognize "assimilation" in the field.

El concepto de la asimilación es uno de los muchos de la literatura sociológica que no han sido rigurosamente examinados en investigaciones prácticas. Este artículo presenta un examen de dicho concepto en un estudio de las relaciones étnicas de un grupo en una comarca rural de Connecticut. Hay tantos factores que entran en cualquier ensayo para determinar la cantidad de asimilación, que el concepto se hace demasiado impreciso para ser de valor en investigaciones científicas. Algunos de estos factores son: la estructura de las clases, las diferencias rurales-urbanas, la heterogeneidad de los valores culturales. La diversificación es tanto en algunos de estos sentidos, que es a menudo imposible determinar la asimilación es tanto en algunos de estos sentidos, que es a menudo imposible determinar la asimilación en casos prácticos.

Many of our commonly-used sociological concepts have never been rigorously tested in field research. They have been accepted uncritically and repeated in text books so frequently that all too many of us merely take them for granted and assume them to be adequate. The present

paper is the result of an attempt to test one of these concepts, that of assimilation, in a field situation.

The paper stems from a larger research project that was set up recently by the Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station to investigate ethnic-group relations in a rural district of Eastern Connecticut comprising the towns of Brooklyn and

† University of Connecticut.

Canterbury. The three largest groups making up the district's population are old stock Yankees, Finns, and French Canadians. Some of the Yankees are farmers, and the Yankees as a group dominate local business and the professions, as well as local politics. Most of the Finns are farmers, while the French Canadians are for the most part factory workers.

The Park and Burgess definition of the concept of assimilation is the most widely accepted:

Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life.¹

But a number of difficulties arose in connection with the use of the assimilation concept. These difficulties, presenting almost insuperable obstacles to the use of the concept in field research, are discussed below:

I. The concept of assimilation refers to two field occurrences.²

Persons and groups may "acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups" and at the same time be excluded from "sharing their experiences" and find themselves indefinitely delayed in being "incorporated with them in a common cultural life." Why? Because the "memories, sentiments, and attitudes" are common property,

vested in the extended community or "Larger Society" and are readily accessible. On the other hand, the matter of sharing experience and incorporation in a common life is limited first, by a willingness on the part of the older group present in a *restricted* community,³ and second, by the desire of the newer group to foster social participation.

These two "occurrences," inculcation and acceptance, do not necessarily take place at the same time, nor does one automatically follow the other. In the district investigated the Finnish school children are inculcated with an entirely new set of loyalties in the public grammar school. Finland becomes for them a vague far-away land, meaningful only from hearing the nostalgic reminiscences of their parents. The Finnish children salute the American flag, soon prefer to use the English language, read American comic strips, play American games, and associate with Yankee children on an equalitarian basis, with neither group of children exhibiting consciousness of ethnic-group differences.

But, in the more highly competitive world of the high school, the Yankee

¹Quite consciously, "assimilation" has not been called a "process" because the controversy over whether or not assimilation is a process falls outside the scope of this paper. Edward C. Hayes, however, restricts the term "process" to activity and change in activity. For him, "assimilation" refers to the *result* following the processes of social suggestion, sympathetic radiation, and imitation. (Edward C. Hayes, "Some Social Relations Restated," *Amer. Jour. Sociol.*, (1925) 31: 333-346).

²A geographic-spatial community as opposed to a "community of discourse."

³Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, 1924, p. 735.

children socially exclude their Finnish schoolmates almost as much as their parents exclude the Finnish children's parents. This exclusion suffered by the Finnish children serves to make them conscious of their Finnish heritage. Some of them, as a defensive measure, then identify themselves as Finns.⁴

Besides the unwillingness of the older group to accept the newer, the lack of desire on the part of the newer to be accepted may delay assimilation. This happens rarely and could ordinarily occur only under the following circumstances: (1) when the foreign-stock group is present in a given area in sufficient numbers to erect a virtually self-contained colony, and, (2) when this foreign-stock group remains convinced that it has a set of cultural values superior to that of the older stock. Thus in the investigation under consideration, it was found that many of the local Finns regard their Yankee neighbors with a scorn bordering on contempt, dismiss them as a decadent group which has lost its right to the land, and speak proudly of their own hard-work and mutual-aid customs which have enabled them to outstrip the Yankee farms in productivity.

II. Factorial analysis must be used with extreme caution.

It is very precarious to list, on the one hand, the factors favoring assimilation, and on the other, the factors

⁴This denial of acceptance by a local "older stock" of a person who has been thoroughly inculcated with American values is especially arbitrary and tragic where the color-line is involved.

unfavorable to it without attempting to weigh their relative influence in the light of the local situation, since a given "factor" may sometimes appear to be working in opposite directions at the same time. For example, in the district investigated, the high productivity of Finnish farms was found to be partly the result of the mutual aid which the Finns voluntarily extend to one another. That high productivity, in turn, has unquestionably raised the status of the Finns as a group in the district.⁵ But paradoxically, this mutual aid is regarded with suspicion by the Yankees and is counted as another evidence of their mysterious "clannishness." This imputed clannishness makes the Yankees skeptical and uncertain about approaching the Finns, and results in a certain amount of hostility towards them.⁶

Thus any listing of factors supposedly either aiding or retarding assimilation is inadequate if divorced from the dynamics of a defined field of activity. Is it sufficient, for example, to list "common religion" as a factor aiding the assimilative process with no reference to a specific investigation, as is commonly done? In the district investigated, the Finns all

⁵As we shall see later, in modern America, occupational status largely determines the range of a person's or a group's primary contacts; and primary contacts are essential to furthering assimilation.

⁶This is not to posit a simple cause-effect relationship: the Yankees are not hostile to the Finns because the Finns are "clannish"; rather, the Yankees are hostile toward the Finns, and use the mutual-aid customs of the Finns to "prove" the clannishness of the Finns, clannishness being considered in some way "un-American."

have a Lutheran background, Lutheranism being the faith of the Finnish State Church. Although few of them are regular churchgoers, still, they do share a "common religion," Protestantism, with the local Yankees. But whatever influence favorable to assimilation is exerted by the factor of "common religion," it tends to be more than counterbalanced by the factor of divergent political beliefs. The local Finns are politically divided into a small conservative group, an equally small group of avowed Communists, and a large group which might be termed mildly socialistic. Partly because of their left wing tendencies, the Yankees tend to regard them with suspicion and distrust, if not with bitter hatred, frequently characterizing them as a "bunch of Reds." Now, "common religion" could have been listed as a factor aiding assimilation and divergent political beliefs as a factor delaying it. But this would not constitute adequate analysis.⁷ Political radicalism far outweighs "common religion" in determining the tone of relations between Finn and Yankee. The Yankees so exclude the Finns from their social life that "common religion" does not operate to any appreciable extent to bring the two groups together. The Yankee churches are making little or no effort

to bring in the Finns. One local pastor even went so far as to justify his failure to invite the Finns to his services by saying "My Yankee parishioners wouldn't stand for it."

III. The history of the immigrant group must be investigated, in the old world as well as the new.

Some of the obstacles to the assimilation of an immigrant group may frequently be explained in terms of the historical processes that took place, and that are taking place, in the land of their birth. In many cases, these difficulties would be encountered no matter what the adopted country.

Before emigrating from Finland the majority of the heads of local Finnish families were *torpars* or at best subsistence farmers with small holdings. They, or their parents, supported the so-called "Red" side during the Finnish Civil War of 1918. The Lutheran Church in Finland, a tax supported State institution, had a pastorate composed of members of Finland's ruling class, the Swedo-Finns. These ministers incited a Holy War against Communism, aided the White Guard, and in some cases even fought alongside White troops. The local Finns brought the resulting animosity against churches and churchmen with them to this country.

The futility of listing "common religion" as a factor aiding assimilation in the local situation thus becomes even more apparent. Previously, the fact that "common religion" offers no basis for social interaction between local Finn and Yankee was explained in terms of an overweening Yankee

⁷This is not meant as an attack on factorial analysis *per se*. Such type of abstraction is a scientific necessity in determining the common elements in large masses of data. The danger, however, is that an investigator of a specific area might accept these generalizations without determining to what extent they were applicable to the local situation.

suspicion of the Finn that precluded a "common religion" from drawing them together. Here we have evidence that the local Finns, in all probability, would have remained anti-religious,⁸ or at best indifferent to religion, irrespective of the tone of interaction between them and the older stock, and regardless of the nation in which they happened to settle. Only a knowledge of the group's old-world history and experiences would offer any clue.

This is no isolated phenomenon. Thomas and Znaniecki have exhaustively described the social disorganization taking place in Poland among the classes from which emigrants to America are largely drawn. As a result of their analysis, they make the following conclusion:

The great majority of emigrants is . . . recruited from those peasant and small town communities in which the contacts with the outside world are relatively numerous and the process of disorganization of the old social structure has been already going on for some time . . . generally speaking, the Polish immigrants whom America receives belong mostly to that type of individuals who are no longer adequately controlled by tradition and have not yet been taught how to organize their lives independently of tradition.⁹

⁸The local Finns who are left-wing, and that includes most of them, regard ministers as lazy, scheming scoundrels, to whom honest work is a stranger.

⁹W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, Alfred A. Knopf, N. Y., 1927, Vol. 2, pp. 1488-1489.

Knowledge of that disorganization taking place in Poland was absolutely essential to an evaluation of America's contribution to the process. Similarly, intensive study of the social environment out of which any emigrant group comes is necessary if the factors influencing assimilation are to be understood.

IV. Rural-Urban differences should be taken into account.

Below are listed a series of hypotheses that are at best tentative and inconclusive, for two reasons: (1) certain old-world behavior-patterns will persist for a time irrespective of location in a rural or urban environment; and, (2) "rural-urban" is a lumped categorization; many census-defined rural areas have sociologically-defined urban characteristics, and *vice versa*.¹⁰ Obviously, specific field researches are necessary to demonstrate the value of such generalizations.

Urban Influences. If the given ethnic-group in the city is found in a concentrated colony, as is typical, the group is enabled to retain a formalized community of its own, with a separate press, its own nationalistic societies, its own first-aid and benefit societies. But the old primary rural-familistic social organization rapidly deteriorates under urban conditions in America. The break with the old-

¹⁰See, for example, the urban characteristics found to exist in the rural town of Montville, Connecticut as described in N. L. Whetten and Walter C. McKain, "A Sociological Analysis of Relief and Non-Relief Families in a Rural Connecticut Town," Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 219, pp. 69-73.

world culture which is made by the second generation is much more rapid than is the case in rural areas. The second generation renounces the group controls that guided their parents without erecting a new purposeful life-organization. They become marginal persons, living in a half-world between two cultures; contemptuous of one, and not completely accepted in the other.

Disorganization is not assimilation, as Thomas and Znaniecki have pointed out. But when assimilation does take place in the city, *its most marked divergence from rural assimilation is its individualistic character, as opposed to group assimilation, typical of rural areas.*

The class-range in the city is much wider than in the country; the population is mobile; occupations can be secured far from the site of the immigrant community; life is more competitive, prompting a constant change of habits and demeanor; and luxury and hedonistic standards prevail. Moreover, it is much easier for the individual to preserve anonymity, to cut himself off from his ethnic-colony in his occupational and social life. It is far easier for him to change his status *as an individual* than in rural areas. And the child of the urban immigrant is only too anxious to sever connections between himself and his ethnic-group in the interest of success-striving.

Furthermore, social contacts in the city typically involve segmental participation. Unsuccessful in one group, the individual has access to others, where he has a certain amount of con-

trol over the liability he wishes to assume. The organizational counterpart of limited involvement is specialized relationships, not rooted in a single set of values or dependent upon a definitive set of controls. Under these conditions, lack of conformity prevails; not only does personal demoralization continue apace, but, in time, the foreign colony is inexorably disintegrated.¹¹

Rural Influences. In contradistinction, the class-range is narrow in rural areas. The old rural-familistic traditions of the foreign group are not violently disrupted, anonymity is difficult to maintain, luxury and hedonistic standards are not so pronounced, and mobility is reduced. The second generation are not so severely disorganized in the country. They are not stimulated and distracted by the chaotic standards of the slum. The rural home offers a solid nexus of personal relationships virtually impossible to maintain amid the specialized functions, the secondary-group life, of the city.

Since the range of conflicting values is not so wide, since it is well-nigh impossible for the second-generation individual to lose identification with his group, social relations typically involve the entire personality. Further, *the raising or lowering of status becomes much more a group matter than an individual, with the*

¹¹An exception occurs when ethnic-group prejudice is very pronounced, such as that frequently aimed at Jews, but especially where the color-line is involved. In such cases the colony remains, albeit on a formalistic basis; personal disorganization, however, continues.

result that the old-world culture traits are not hurriedly sloughed off. Such sloughing off, even if it could be accomplished, would not bring significant changes to his life-organization as happens under urban conditions, nor could he then function in his ethnic-group which is ever with him and necessary to him. The old-world culture traits also change under rural conditions, but more slowly, and a "sounder" blending with the new ways current in the new environment results.

In regard to the two "occurrences" comprising assimilation mentioned above, inculcation and acceptance, rural living decelerates the acquiring of the new sentiments and attitudes, but it hastens "incorporation in a common cultural life." The city, on the other hand, forces the adoption of new sentiments and attitudes, but so hurriedly and haphazardly that catastrophic rather than organic change results, *i.e.*, disorganization rather than completed assimilation.

Finally, there are several distinctions that might be made between village and farm life in this discussion of rural assimilation. On the farm, there is a common occupational activity that draws the family and the local ethnic-group together. Among farmers there is very little of the economic rivalry characteristic of village and urban occupations. Since the farmer is an independent producer many clashes are avoided between older and newer peoples which are common to city and village.¹² Group-exclusion is not practiced so much by the older stock in a farming area as

an accompaniment to this reduced economic rivalry, except, perhaps, where the farming immigrant colony is large enough to erect a socially-sufficient sub-committee of its own and/or an extreme conflict-situation develops. Both of these conditions are met by the Finnish group referred to above: there is very little association between them and the Yankees because they maintain a large sub-community and are deemed political radicals by the Yankees.

V. Research on assimilation must take the class-structure into account.¹³

There is increasing evidence that our class-structure is rapidly crystallizing.¹⁴ This applies especially to many ethnic-groups that have long

¹²The village-dweller is forced into various forms of social participation which the urbanite and farmer can avoid. See Mary M. Wood, *The Stranger*, Columbia University Press, N. Y., 1934, esp. pp. 213-14.

¹³Interestingly enough, nowhere do Park and Burgess deal specifically with the class-structure in the section on Assimilation in *Introduction to The Science of Sociology*. On page 762, *op. cit.*, they speak of assimilation of the Negro house-servant during slavery days as taking place "rapidly." The inference is obvious: assimilation can and does take place at static class levels.

¹⁴The Lynds point out that the "industrial ladder of opportunity" is contracting in Middletown (Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., N. Y., 1937, pp. 70-71). Howard Bell concludes that the mass of Maryland youth are faced by "frozen" social levels (Howard M. Bell, *Youth Tell Their Story*, published by the American Council of Education, Washington, D. C., 1938, esp. p. 47). For the past 55 years farm tenancy has been steadily increasing (from 25 percent of all farmers in 1880 to 42 percent in 1935), ownership decreasing. See *Farm Tenancy*, Report of The President's Committee, February, 1937, esp. page 3. See also Lewis Corey, *The Crisis of the Middle Class*, Covici Friede, N. Y., 1935, esp. pp. 20-35.

been associated with one type of occupation in a given community.¹⁵ As Park and Burgess recognized, assimilation is facilitated by primary, not secondary, contacts;¹⁶ but increasingly, many ethnic-groups within a given community, are finding social participation limited to their own group, or at best within the narrow class-range their group covers:

In a mobile society such as that of America, the job one holds is the most important single index of social and economic status. It determines the neighborhood in which one lives, what people one may associate with, and what clubs one may join. But when, in addition, whole occupations are identified with certain ethnic groups, the job is still further restrictive in determining one's neighborhood, friends, and acquaintances in terms of ethnic as well as economic acceptability. Members of each ethnic group discover, even in the second and third generation, that their social rating in the community is determined in large part by the occupations pursued by the majority of their members.¹⁷

¹⁵Woofter discusses the difficulty certain foreign-stock groups experience in attempting to advance themselves in industry (T. J. Woofter, "The Status of Racial and Ethnic Groups," pp. 553-601, especially pp. 581-582 in *Recent Social Trends*, Vol. 1, McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1933).

¹⁶"Assimilation naturally takes place most rapidly where contacts are primary, that is, where they are the most intimate and intense, as in the area of touch relationship, in the family circle, and in intimate congenial groups. Secondary contacts facilitate accommodation, but do not greatly promote assimilation. The contact here are external and too remote." Park and Burgess, *op. cit.*, pp. 736-737.

If large segments of our foreign-stock population are cut off from "sharing a common life," with the middle strata of our society, how much is this due to class differences as well as ethnic-group differences? In the investigation now being carried on at the Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station the majority of the French-Canadians were found to be excluded from intimate association with the Yankees; not so much because they are a foreign-stock group (on the average, the French-Canadians have been resident in the country and the district longer than any of the other local foreign-stock groups) but because most of the French-Canadian heads of families are mill-hands.

In fact it is highly probable that many so-called "problems of assimilation" represent nothing more nor less than a "normal" aspect of the present class-structure. Various ethnic-groups are labelled "unassimilable"—in this way, expression of class-bias becomes tacit rather than avowed, and the ideology of democracy remains unchallenged:

. . . The culturally dominant race, shocked by the 'airs' these people assume, fears being 'over-run'; it believes that the status and 'rights' of the American 'class' are being jeopardized. In this manner the social reality is interpreted not in terms of a differentiation in classes but in terms of an antithesis between

¹⁷Elin L. Anderson, *We Americans*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1937, p. 53. The above quotation represents a generalization based upon a specific community-study, that of Burlington, Vermont.

Americans and the intruding immigrant nationalities, against whose 'un-American' ways the Americans must uphold the heritage of the fathers. People are looked down upon, not because they are considered to belong to a lower class, but because of their imputed inferior cultural status—they are not up to the American standard. By the use of this stereotype the ideology remains untouched.¹⁸

Finally, Park and Burgess claim that in "a free society competition tends to destroy classes and castes."¹⁹ Disregarding the fact that this is circular reasoning, the statement must be qualified with empirical conditions. In the local situation the Finnish farmers have competed so successfully with the Yankee farmers that the latter are surely though slowly being driven off the land.²⁰ While economic success has given the Finns a certain amount of prestige in the community, at the same time the animosity and fear this success has engendered among the Yankees goes far to prevent the establishment of "primary contacts" between the two groups, the contacts Park and Burgess deem necessary to assimilation.

¹⁸B. Schrieke, *Alien Americans*, Viking Press, New York, 1936, pp. 92-93.

¹⁹Park and Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

²⁰It is believed this would constitute "competition" as defined by Park and Burgess since it is continuous and geared to an "impersonal" market, not "intermittent" and "personal," as conflict is so distinguished. See p. 574 for their distinction of the terms.

In the light of the data presented, the conclusion is obvious that the concept of assimilation is an unprecise and unwieldy tool of analysis. It has an arbitrary all-or-none quality that is completely divorced from reality.

A functioning society exhibits both diversity and integration, and diversity is especially marked in modern Western cultures. After all, exactly what is a "common cultural life" in modern America? In the district now being studied by the Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station, the Finnish and Yankee farmers probably share a far more "common cultural life" than those Yankee farmers share with Yankee college professors, Yankee corporation lawyers, and Yankee society matrons. In a culture characterized by heterogeneity, conflicting codes, conflicting values; a culture virtually compartmentalized along many planes, such as occupation, region, and class, how is "assimilation" to be recognized in the field?

The concept of assimilation will probably retain its status as a democratic article of faith, but as a scientific formulation it must be rejected. Science involves a constant shuttling between the particular observation and the generalized formulation. When a given generalized formulation can not be made to "fit" the particular observation without being so qualified that all precision is lost, then a new formulation must be sought.

How Satisfying Is Rural Life?

By Lowry Nelson† and Edgar McVoy‡

ABSTRACT

While the satisfactions supposedly inherent in rural life have been the subject of observations of writers on social themes from very early times, little has been done by way of a more objective measurement of reactions of rural people themselves to the kind of life they lead. This study reports one such attempt in Isanti County, Minnesota. The random sample included both farm and village women. The results indicate that degree of satisfaction with items in family living is related to economic status, place of residence (village or farm), nativity, age, education, family composition, social participation, and general social adjustments. Farm women showed higher dissatisfaction on all categories of family living than did the village women. Security was apparently the item of greatest dissatisfaction among village women, with clothing ranking first in the case of the farm women. Lowest dissatisfaction scores for both farm and village women was in the matter of social participation.

Aunque los satisfacciones considerados estar inherent en la vida rural han sido el sujeto de observaciones de los escritores en las temas social desde muchos anos, muy poco se ha hecho por la via de medicion mas objetivo de las reacciones de la gente rural en respecto de la vida que se viven. Esta investigacion se presenta los resultados de tal estudio en el condado de Isanti, Minnesota. La muestra, tomada a la ventura, se incluida mujeres viviendo en las plazas y en las granjas. Los resultados se indican que el grado de satisfaccion con los items de vivir de la familia estan allegado al posicion economico, a donde viven (plaza o granja), nacimiento, edad, educacion, composicion de la familia, participacion social, y ajustes social generalmente. Las mujeres viviendo en las granjas se muestran un discontento mas alta en toda las categorias cuando comparados a las mujeres de las plazas. Evidentemente, la seguridad era la item de discontento mejor entre las mujeres viviendo en las plazas. La ropa se toma primer lugar en caso de las mujeres viviendo en las granjas. Las muescas mas discontentos entre los mujeres de las dos grupos estaban en la manera de la participacion social.

There are two extreme views of rural life with reference to its desirability or undesirability. One of these views is optimistic, the other pessimistic. The optimistic view has been current from the days of the classical Greeks down to the present time. Briefly stated, it is to the effect that rural life is more satisfying to human beings because it is more

"natural," and that rural people are more moral, more industrious and frugal, braver and more patriotic, more stable socially and generally better adjusted and more happy. The opposing view is that rural life is dull and depressing, full of frustrations due to poverty, isolation and the hazards of nature. It breeds a population which is dull-witted and crude in manners; inured to unending toil "with the emptiness of ages in their faces." Such a view was abundantly expressed in the "literature of despair" of such writers as Hamlin Garland, Sinclair Lewis and other

* Paper No. 460, Miscellaneous Journal Series Article, Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

† Rural Sociologist, Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota.

‡ Labor Division, Farm Security Administration, Washington, D. C.

novelists of the farm and small town.

These observations on the qualitative aspects of rural life are usually superficial and the result of the subjective reactions of the observer. Moreover, they are based upon few cases, as a rule, and no adequate picture results. There can be no question that numerous instances can be found to corroborate either of the two extreme views noted above. Human life in all environments has its sordid and drab, as well as its happy and satisfying aspects. Rural life is no exception. Whether it is peculiarly unsatisfactory to the people themselves has not been verified in any adequate manner.

Studies of family living, both rural and urban, in this country and abroad, have been made in great numbers.¹ From LePlay down to the most recent ones, they are largely empirical studies of incomes and expenditures, for various items in family living. On the basis of these studies it has been possible to generalize concerning the proportioning of the expenditures for different items in the budget by types of families and amount of income, and to correlate income and distribution of expenditures with factors such as amount of education and occupation. But these studies have left untouched the measurement of the satisfaction value of various possessions, or the degree of unsatisfaction resulting from their lack. What does it mean to the individual that he or she does

not have running water in the home, or electricity, or an automobile, or means to educate the children or provide medical care, or take an annual vacation trip?

The authors' concept of desirability and undesirability is based on efficiency in satisfying human needs or wants. To make this concept workable we must have an accurate picture of what constitute the fundamental human needs. One of the most exhaustive and satisfactory analyses of basic needs of man has been prepared by Robert Morey.² Following studies of man in several "primitive" as well as "advanced" societies from a physiological approach, Morey sums up the basic needs of man in society as follows:

The need for adequate external energy and supplementary stimulation to elicit habitual responses initiated by internal and unavoidable stimuli. This includes food, water, air, materials used in sleeping, materials used to control temperature and excessive stimulation, and materials used to control forces that destroy healthy tissues or that produce lasting pain. Sex objects would not be included as basic for every individual.

The need for bodily conditions permitting habitual responses to usual stimuli. Fairly constant metabolism within the body and an even body temperature along with healthy tissue functioning without lasting pain are required to satisfy this basic need.

¹For a comprehensive list of such studies, see Zimmerman, C. C., *Consumption and Standards of Living*. New York. D van Nostrand, 1936.

²Morey, Robert, "Basic Needs of Man in Society." *Journal of Educational Research*, 34:1-14, Sept., 1940.

The need for predictable and usually favorable surroundings in which to function.

Accepting these as basic, irreducible needs of man in society, our evaluation of rural vs. town life must be in terms of the adequacy of each in satisfying these needs. Does rural life provide "food, water, air, materials used in sleeping," etc., more efficiently than does town life? Does it offer "predictable and usually favorable surroundings in which to function," in greater measure than does urban? American stereotyped opinions would probably be "Yes" to both questions, following our traditional concept of rural life. But studies of health and nutrition and of economic security in rural areas since World War I have cast much doubt on the desirability of rural life on these scores. We have come to the point where we must reexamine the old generalizations about rural life satisfactions. The soundest approach is to try to measure by the most accurate means available the extent to which the basic human needs are satisfied. We must recognize the tremendous variations within either rural or urban societies. Finally, we must try to isolate factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction, independent of rural or urban residence.

During the past two years, four attempts have been made by rural sociologists (to the knowledge of the authors) to apply scientific methods to the study of rural and urban life satisfactions.

The first is the *Rural and Urban*

Life Questionnaire, prepared by Forsyth and designed to measure preference for rural or urban way of life.³ The second is a comparison of the adjustment of aged persons in rural and in urban areas by Dinkel, utilizing primarily an intensive analysis of selected cases.⁴ He found the aged studied in a rural county of southern Minnesota generally better adjusted than those studied in Minneapolis.

The third venture is that of Mangus and Cottam, which was a study of the life adjustment of samples of farm people in three areas of Ohio.⁵ They used an elaborate questionnaire, containing various approaches to the measurement of adjustment. Their general conclusions are quoted below:

The results of the study show that Ohio farm people are generally well satisfied, but that the degree of their satisfaction depends to a considerable extent upon the circumstances under which they live. Whether some are inherently happy, contented, and quick to make adjustments to any ordinary circumstance, the present study does not attempt to show. That social adjustment, level of living, and social participation are closely associated is clearly shown. It is further dem-

³Forsyth, F. Howard, "Measuring Attitude Toward Rural and Urban Life," *Rural Sociology*, 6:3:234-241, September, 1941.

⁴Dinkel, R. M., Unpublished manuscript of a study carried out at the Agricultural Experiment Station, Division of Rural Sociology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

⁵Mangus, A. R., and Cottam, H. R. "Level of Living, Social Participation, and Adjustment of Ohio Farm People." *Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Bul. 624*, Wooster, Ohio, Sept., 1941.

onstrated that all of these factors are dependent to some extent upon other environmental factors, such as age, place of residence, size of family, religion, education, and occupational status. . . .

Regardless of their social and economic circumstances, Ohio farm people are generally well satisfied with their ways of living. . . .

Ohio farm families differ widely with respect to their levels of living, and those ranking high on the scale of living are much better adjusted than are those ranking low. . . .

The majority of farm people participate very little in organized groups, but those who do participate are better adjusted than those who do not. . . .

Persons in families that rank high on the scale of living participate much more actively in organized groups than those in low-ranking families. . . .

The degree of social adjustment is approximately the same in the major geographical areas of the State although both level of living and social participation differ widely among the areas. . . .

Although the chances of a satisfying life on the farm are greatly increased for those who have a high level of living and who are active participants in organized groups, these factors alone do not assure satisfactory adjustment to farm life. Likewise, although the extent of social participation is influenced by the levels of living of the participants, it is also affected by other factors.

The fourth study is that of the present authors and was carried out at the University of Minnesota Agri-

cultural Experiment Station in 1939 and 1940. Other sources⁶ have described in the detail the method of the study, so that the present article will be confined to a statement of findings and an interpretation of them. Briefly stated, the technique used was to present a check-list of items in family living to a sample of farm and village people, and to get a rating, on a five-point scale, of the degree of satisfaction expressed by each subject for each item. Then a summation was made to formulate a general satisfaction score. The main categories of items presented were as follows: house and yard, household conveniences, food, clothing, education, health recreation, participation, work conditions, automobile, security.

Following is a set of general conclusions which the study seems to warrant, for the area sampled:

1. The nature and extent of wants and the degree of their satisfaction differ with variations in age, occupation, place of living, nationality, education, socio-economic status, social participation, and family composition.

2. Degree of satisfaction tends to increase with income and socio-economic status. There is a marked relationship between these two factors, somewhat less so at the extremes, and stronger for village than for farm women.

⁶For a description of the method see McVoy, E. C., "A Method of Measuring the Satisfaction of Wants," *Sociometry*, Feb., 1942, pp. 80-88. See also McVoy, E. C., *A Study of Wants and Their Satisfaction among a Sample of Rural People in Minnesota*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Minnesota, 1941.

3. Degree of satisfaction increases with amount of social participation. Correlation between these two factors is low for the village women, negligible for farm women.

4. Degree of satisfaction increases with degree of general adjustment. Association between these two factors is moderately high, somewhat lower for farm than for village women.

5. Degree of satisfaction increases with amount of happiness according to a self-rating.

6. Degree of satisfaction is not clearly related to number of children at home; for farm and village women together, the correlation is low negative; for farm women it is moderate negative, and for village women it is low positive.

7. Degree of satisfaction increases with amount of education. Correlation is low for village, negligible for farm women.

8. Degree of satisfaction is not clearly related to age. Correlation is low negative for village, very low positive for farm women.

9. Satisfaction is related to nationality and to nationality of parents. Foreign-born women on farms have a higher degree of satisfaction than the native-born, but the native-born are better satisfied in the village. For both farm and village, those of foreign-born parentage are better satisfied than those of native-born parentage.

10. Satisfaction is related to receipt of relief and other public aid. Those receiving aid show a signifi-

cantly lower degree of satisfaction than those not receiving aid.

11. As compared with farm women, village women have a higher socio-economic status, higher degree of satisfaction and of general adjustment, a higher self-rating of happiness, higher amount of social participation, more years of education, fewer children; they average several years younger; they contain somewhat fewer foreign-born and persons of foreign-born parentage; fewer receive public relief or aid.

12. When matched for socio-economic status, participation, number of children at home, school grade completed, and age, farm and village women still differed significantly in satisfaction and general adjustment and happiness.

13. In the disposal of a cash gift of \$1,000, both farm and village women would use it most often for some purpose related to the home. Farm women, more frequently than village, would spend the money for food, clothing, living expenses, and automobile, while village women would more often spend it for travel, children's education, and items less closely related to the physical necessities of living.

14. In choice of a place of residence, 60 percent of the farm women prefer farm, whereas 88 percent of the village women prefer village.

15. In comparing general categories of items in family living, it is found that farm women show least satisfaction with clothing, automobile, security, and work conditions.

Village women show least with clothing, automobile, work conditions, recreation, and health.

16. Farm women tend to rate all items less important than do village women. Of the major categories given, only automobile, clothing, and work conditions were rated more important by farm women. The two groups concurred in giving the greatest weight to categories of food, health, clothing, and security, least to work conditions, recreation, and participation.

It is interesting to compare the findings of this study with those of Mangus and Cottam. Generally speaking, the two studies agree in showing a close association between social adjustment (or satisfaction), level of living (socio-economic status), and social participation. The findings diverge in the degree of satisfaction of farm people. The Ohio study reported farm people "generally well satisfied with their ways of living," whereas the Minnesota study showed them to be only "fairly" well satisfied. Since Isanti County is in an agricultural area of only average productivity, it might well be that farm people in better agricultural areas of the state would show greater satisfaction. In the Ohio study, however, little variation in adjustment was found in areas differing in level of living. The Ohio and Minnesota studies are parallel in showing a small amount of social participation on the part of farm people. They differ in that in Ohio those who do

participate were found better adjusted than those who do not, whereas in Minnesota, the correlation between satisfaction and participation for farm people was negligible. The studies agree in demonstrating that factors other than level of living or socio-economic status affect social adjustment or satisfaction. While the correlation in Minnesota between the two factors is rather high, it is far from perfect, and there were a number of deviants from the trend.

The findings of our study corroborate those of Forsyth, that the longer a person resides in a certain type of area, the more likely he is to be favorably disposed toward it. This tendency is in line with our knowledge of conditioning, especially of early social conditioning in determining life attitudes.

In relating the findings of our study to Morey's classification, we might identify categories of house and yard, household conveniences, food, clothing, health, and to some extent recreation and other categories with the first two basic needs. Categories of education, participation, work conditions, security, and to some extent recreation, tie in most closely with the third basic need. In Table 1 is given a set of index figures showing satisfaction of village and farm women with these various categories. In interpreting the table, it should be remembered that a rating of 0 indicates excellent satisfaction; 1, good; 2, fair; 3, poor; and 4, very bad.

TABLE 1. SATISFACTION OF RURAL WOMEN (FARM AND VILLAGE) WITH CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF FAMILY LIVING

	<i>Farm</i>	<i>Village</i>
Social participation	1.35	1.15
Education	1.60	1.37
Health	1.73	1.50
Food	1.75	1.19
Recreation	1.77	1.50
House and yard	1.90	1.42
Household conveniences	1.92	1.35
Work conditions	2.07	1.56
Security	2.12	1.71
Automobile	2.13	1.60
Clothing	2.17	1.63
All categories	1.89	1.50

We might conclude from this table that farm women find their way of life generally "fair," whereas village women find theirs "good." The order of satisfaction with various categories of family living is similar for the two groups, the notable exceptions being the more satisfactory ratings given food and household conveniences by village women. We can surmise that in Isanti county, village life is more efficient as a want-satis-

fier than farm life. As far as the basic needs are concerned, it appears that none of them are completely satisfied in either farm or village, but that farm people are especially lacking in satisfactory materials to meet the first basic need, and that both groups have a feeling of insecurity, evidence of inability to satisfy the third basic need. Again, the farm group is most seriously lacking.

The studies made are too limited to warrant any final conclusions concerning the satisfying quality of rural life in general. Future study calls for refinement of method and extension to more samples of both rural and urban people. The greatest difficulty will be in developing instruments applicable to widely varying societies and social classes, but it is our opinion that this end can be accomplished by a continual focus on basic needs, common to all mankind.

The Problem of Rural Housing In the South*

By T. G. Standing†

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have indicated that a close relationship exists between the quality of housing and the health and morals of the population. There is evidence that, in general, the poorest housing in the United States is found in rural areas, particularly in the South.

The conviction is growing that a democratic society cannot afford to permit large numbers of its citizens to live in conditions that are clearly detrimental to their welfare. This applies particularly to children, of whom a disproportionate number are found in the rural homes of the South.

Programs for the improvement of rural housing should recognize geographic and cultural variations but the structure of the dwelling should be determined primarily by the needs of the family. An effective program of rural housing

* Adapted from a paper presented at the Southern Agricultural Workers Conference, Memphis, Tennessee, February 5, 1942.

† Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S.D.A.

improvement will probably require some form of public subsidy. With proper planning such a program might well help to lessen the shock of conversion to a peacetime economy following the war.

Muchas investigaciones han indicado que una afinidad muy cercana existe entre la calidad de alojamiento y la salud y morales de la población. Hay evidencia generalmente, que las casas más pobres de los Estados Unidos están en las áreas rurales, particularmente en el Sur.

El convencimiento está creciendo que una sociedad democrática no puede tener medios a permitir muchos ciudadanos a vivir en condiciones desventajosas para su bienestar. Esto está particularmente aplicable a los niños, de quienes son un número muy grande en las casas rurales del Sur.

Programas para mejorar las casas rurales deben reconocer variaciones geográficas y culturales pero la estructura de la familia. Un programa efectivamente para mejorar las casas rurales necesitaría alguna clase de subsidio público. Con métodos propios un programa como ese ayudaría disminuir el choque de conversión a una economía de paz de la guerra.

It has been said that the history of housing is the history of civilization. While there is much truth in this statement it must be admitted that in the field of dwelling construction, as in many other phases of his culture, the benefits of man's advancing knowledge have been very unequally distributed. In fact, a widespread interest in adequate housing for the masses, particularly in rural areas, is a fairly modern development.

In the United States recent interest in the problem was stimulated by a desire to provide work for the unemployed during the economic depression, while at the present time public attention is being directed to the importance of good housing as a factor in national health and morale so essential to the successful prosecution of the war.

While such considerations as these are of utmost importance it is unlikely that the housing problem will be solved as a by-product of national emergency. It will be adequately met only when public opinion demands the provision of decent living quarters, not as a war measure or an expedient for putting idle men to

work, but as the right of every citizen in a democratic society. The obligation of society to provide educational facilities, fire, police, and some degree of health protection, and many other services to its citizens has long been recognized. There is even more reason for public insistence on decent housing, for unless this basic necessity is met the potential benefits of these other services will not be fully realized.

Social and Cultural Factors In Housing

A fundamental principle in house construction is that the dwelling should be adapted to the needs of the family unit. Since these needs have changed in response to changes in the family itself and its relation to the outside world, the physical structure of the home should be correspondingly modified. Housing requirements under pioneer conditions were very different from those today because the activities and needs of the family members were different. In pioneer days families were larger, a variety of economic functions since transferred to the factory were then performed in the home; modern bathrooms and electric lights were not de-

sired because they were not yet invented.

Much romantic nonsense is preached about the virtues of the pioneer dwelling, with its absence of modern conveniences and sanitary facilities. The primitive log cabin has been glorified as the typical birthplace of presidents. Dwellings of this type were doubtless well suited to the resources and needs of the people of the frontier but they are not adapted to the requirements of civilized life in the United States in 1942. The fact that our grandparents lived in crude dwellings, inadequately heated and lighted and with no sanitary facilities or conveniences, is no justification for the existence of similar conditions today.

Various statements concerning minimum standards for modern rural housing are available. One of the most recent is a leaflet issued by the United States Department of Agriculture entitled *Minimum Requirements for Farmhouses*.¹ The "minimum requirements" described in this bulletin are extremely modest when viewed against the background of our national wealth and technical resources; but even so, a large proportion of American farm homes fall far short of measuring up to them.

A few considerations of especial sociological significance may be mentioned in connection with the problem of minimum standards for farm dwellings. In these days, even in rural areas, the home must compete with many other agencies for the time and

loyalty of the family members. This is particularly true in the case of children, and, since children are more numerous in rural than in urban homes, it is all the more essential that attention be given to the quality of rural dwellings. Unless the home can provide at least some facilities for recreation, study, the entertainment of friends and inter-family visiting, it is likely to lose out in competition with other agencies whose influence upon the young may be less beneficial. Some of these considerations involve the matter of home furnishings, such as radios, books and recreational equipment, but to a large extent they involve the simple basic requirement of space where these activities can be carried on. We do not know how much of the educational retardation of children from low income farm families is due to the simple fact that they do not have adequate facilities for home study, but it is very probably an important factor. Some degree of privacy is essential to the mental and moral health of both children and adults. Its absence is a deficiency commonly attributed to urban areas, but it is a characteristic of many rural families as well.

Any formulation of minimum standards for rural housing should take into consideration the matter of regional variations. This is recognized in another publication of the Department of Agriculture, *Housing Requirements of Farm Families in the United States*,² in which housing

¹Miscellaneous Publication No. 475, October 1941.

²Maud Wilson, Misc. Publication No. 322, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., February 1939, 40 pp.

standards are suggested for some 14 different regions and sub-regions in the United States.

Two general types of regional variations may be distinguished, the *geographic* and the *cultural*. The nature of the climate and topography and the character of the building sites and materials locally available will, to some extent, influence the type of dwelling construction which should be recommended for a particular area. Of equal or perhaps greater importance are the cultural variations from region to region. In other words the standards of housing which the people have already set for themselves, those they actually have as well as those they would like to have, should be given consideration. It is probable that, in general, a housing program will encounter serious difficulties if it seeks to depart very radically from the "going" standards of the area as defined in terms of what the majority of the people consider to be necessary or desirable. This will be true if the objectives of the program are markedly above the accepted standard of the area and also if they are markedly below them. Probably most sharecropper families, white or black, would consider a front or side porch of more importance than a bathroom. In the opinion of the house planners in Washington the bathroom may be far more essential but unless it is actually wanted or at least believed to be desirable by the family that is to live in the house, the wisdom of providing it may be seriously questioned.

It should be recognized that cul-

tural standards are susceptible of change. A major function of the rural schools and the Agricultural Extension Service is, through the educational process, to bring about changes in the standards of farm people so that they will more nearly conform to the best scientific knowledge that is available.

The culture of a given area may prescribe different standards of housing for different groups within the population. This is particularly likely to be the case where there are differences in race, or wide and long-standing variations in socio-economic status. Where such conditions exist a program of housing improvement is likely to encounter the opposition of those groups that enjoy the superior status. Part of the opposition or indifference to slum clearance in cities or the improvements of housing for farm laborers or sharecroppers in rural areas may be due to the desire of superior status groups to protect their favorable position in the social order. Many people are more interested in keeping their own neighborhoods "exclusive" than in keeping the whole community healthy.

In such instances the most effective way to bring about desired changes is probably through a program of education directed both to the groups whose standards are believed to be too low and also to those whose standards are already adequate. In the case of the latter the objective of such an educational program would be to secure a recognition of the fact that conditions which injure the health and morals of one part of the

population are certain to endanger the welfare of the entire community. As Booker Washington once said, "It is hard to hold a man in a ditch without staying in the ditch with him." Disease germs infect rich or poor and black or white without discrimination. Purely as a matter of self-interest, if for no other reason, those who are fortunate enough to live in decent houses should be concerned about the portion of the community that is poorly housed.

An educational program for the ill-housed should seek to arouse a desire for something better, at least enough better to insure good health and a fair degree of comfort. As indicated previously, unless better housing and home facilities are actually wanted and their importance understood by the families who are to use them their anticipated benefits may not be realized.

Numerous studies have been made which seem to indicate beyond question the undesirable consequences of poor living quarters. Most of these studies are from urban areas but there is reason to believe that the findings are applicable to rural areas as well. Overcrowding is a factor which is relatively easy to measure and which apparently has much social significance because of its association with other factors such as health, disease, and delinquency. Any farmer knows the harmful results of overcrowding of plants or farm animals but the consequences of squeezing a family of six or eight into a two or three room shack are not so well understood.³

Crime, immorality and juvenile delinquency are difficult to measure and their causes are admittedly complex. However, crowded conditions in the home, with resulting lack of privacy and the necessity for young and old of both sexes to utilize the same sleeping quarters and toilet facilities are undoubtedly contributing factors both in city and country. Clifford Shaw's studies in Chicago indicate that one-fourth of the city's juvenile delinquency cases come from overcrowded slum areas containing only 11 percent of the total juvenile population. Similar studies in Birmingham and other cities show a like relationship.⁴

These are urban studies but as M. L. Wilson says, "In terms of human lives bad housing means much the same in the country as it does in the city. Sickness, for instance, strikes quicker when families are ill-housed."⁵ Country doctors often feel like giving up in despair when they are confronted with conditions found in many rural homes. Without adequate sanitation and screening, medical treatment is almost useless in such diseases as hookworm and malaria.

In some respects the inadequacies of rural housing are more significant and direct in their effects than are similar deficiencies in the city. Children are most affected and, as in-

³See Edith Elmer Wood, *Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States*. U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington (1936), p. 8.

⁴Summarized in Langdon W. Post, *The Challenge of Housing*, N. Y. 1938, pp. 55-56.

⁵M. L. Wilson, "Rural Housing," *Journal of Home Economics*, Vol. 31, January 1939, p. 28.

dicated previously, there are more children in farm homes than in city homes. The farm home, to a greater extent than its city counterpart, is the center of the economic and social activities of the family members. Deficiencies in city homes may be offset to a greater extent by the provision of public services, such as garbage collection and sewage disposal, than is the case in the country.

The Present Situation with Respect To Rural Housing

Information on rural housing is less complete than is the case for urban areas but enough is available to indicate that the poorest housing in the United States is found on farms. A large number of the farm homes of the nation are without the conveniences and sanitary facilities that are common even in the poorest areas of our cities. Probably one-fourth of the farm people in the Nation are housed in what would be called in the city "slum conditions."

The National Farm Housing Survey conducted in 1934 disclosed that only about one-half of the rural farm dwellings in the United States were in good structural condition. About 15 percent needed replacement of foundations; a somewhat larger number needed to be completely re-roofed, and a somewhat smaller number needed new floors and replacement or extensive repair of exterior walls. Eighty-five percent of the houses were found to be over 10 years old and 20 percent were over 50 years old. More than a fourth of the houses had no screens and in over 40 percent

of the remainder the screens were torn and offered inadequate protection. Only 9 percent of the farm dwellings had indoor toilets while over 13 percent were lacking even in outdoor toilets. The survey also showed serious overcrowding in many sections, particularly in the South, parts of the Great Plains and in the Ozark-Appalachian mountain areas. Some of these conditions may have improved since 1934 but evidence from the 1940 Census and from various special studies⁶ indicates that on the whole the Nation has been going backward rather than forward in the quality of rural housing.

Along with these structural deficiencies there is a general absence in farm homes of most of the facilities and modern conveniences which we would like to think of as characteristic of the American standard of living. Notwithstanding recent extension of rural electrification, two-thirds of all farm homes in the Nation are still without electric lights; three-fourths are without telephones and a much larger proportion are without bath rooms or running water.

As indicated in the report on *Economic Conditions of the South*, prepared for the President by the National Emergency Council, a much larger proportion of southern farm homes lack these facilities than is the

⁶See, for example, Dean G. Carter, *Arkansas Farm Housing Conditions and Needs*, Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 305, June 1934 and Ellen LeNoir and T. Lynn Smith, *Rural Housing in Louisiana*, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 290, August 1937.

case in most other portions of the Nation. More than a third of southern farm houses do not have screens to keep out mosquitoes and flies. Nearly one-fifth have no toilets of any description. In view of these facts it is understandable why hookworm infection and anemia are widespread in this region. Malaria, which infects annually more than 2,000,000 people, is also closely related to inadequate screening and poor sanitation in southern farm homes.

The Improvement of Rural Housing

It is not proposed here to lay down a blue print for a rural housing program but rather to suggest some additional factors that must be given consideration in the development of such a program.

It should be recognized that the causes which have brought the present situation about are complex and that poor housing is only one of a number of closely interrelated consequences of these causes. Undoubtedly one of the most basic factors in the whole situation is inadequate family income. As Raymond Smith has stated, "Under present conditions, family income exerts almost an iron control upon the kind of housing our people can enjoy, both in rural areas and in cities. . . . It is estimated that some 80 percent of the farm families of America obtain less than \$1,000 a year net income, that 55 percent of them get less than \$500 per year, and that 29 percent earn less than \$250. It is easy to see what these figures mean in terms of farm housing."⁷

This is not the place to discuss in detail the problem of low farm in-

come or possible ways in which it might be increased. Low farm prices, soil depletion, mechanization and high birth rates have helped to make a large proportion of farmer families poor and have thus prevented them from enjoying the benefits of decent housing. A farm program that has helped to raise cash farm income more than four billion dollars since 1932 has doubtless kept the situation from becoming far worse than it is at present. That it has not done more is probably due in part to the fact that too small a proportion of this total was received by the low income families that needed it most.

There are, of course, other economic obstacles to adequate rural housing, such as high material and labor costs and inadequate credit facilities. Another factor is the intimate relation that exists between the farm house and the farm land. Unlike the urban situation the house and the job on the farm are not easily separated. Because of high land prices the part of his income that the owner must use to pay for his farm frequently leaves very little margin to spend on housing, either for himself or for his tenants or laborers. The fact that over one-half of the South's farm families are tenants, without any equity in the land, is a complicating factor. All of these obstacles, however, are secondary to the basic fact of inadequate farm income.

⁷U.S.D.A. mimeographed release "The Improvement of Rural Housing," An address by Raymond C. Smith, Chief Program Analyst, at the Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Home Economics Association, Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1941.

The housing problem thus becomes a phase of the more inclusive problem of providing every able-bodied citizen with the opportunity to earn an income which will permit at least a minimum level of living. This is not a utopian dream for a country with the resources and productive capacity of the United States but until ways can be found for achieving this objective it may be that the only alternative means of providing decent homes for low income farm families is some form of public subsidy.

There is ample precedent for this in the experience of various European nations and in the field of urban housing in the United States. Relatively little has been done along this line in rural areas but the need is urgent and the conviction is growing that for both rural and urban areas there is a minimum level of housing below which a democratic society cannot afford to permit its citizens to fall.

Even in the rural field, some essential pioneering has been done. The Resettlement and Farm Security Administrations have accumulated a body of experience which should prove extremely valuable. Mistakes have admittedly been made but these are probably inevitable in the experimental phase of any new undertaking. The Agricultural Extension Service has long been concerned with the improvement of rural housing and is equipped to handle the educational phases of an expanded program.

County and state planning committees throughout the Nation have also given much thought to the prob-

lem, particularly with reference to the development of a post-war program of housing improvement. Attention has been called to the fact that in many areas where the need is greatest, particularly in the South, ample resources of local labor and materials are available for utilization in a housing program. Where such a situation exists actual cash expenditures need not be very great.

There is general agreement that a program of rural housing improvement should be high on the list of priorities of problems to which the Nation should give its attention when the war in which we are now engaged has been won. It should not be wholly neglected even during the period of emergency. Of particular importance at the present time is the provision of adequate facilities to house the millions of workers in defense industries which are being established all over the Nation, many of them in rural areas. The Division of Defense Housing Coordination has been charged with the responsibility of preventing retardation of the war program because of a lack of adequate housing for workers and their families. It is believed that at least a portion of the effort to provide homes for workers in war industries in rural areas can be made to contribute to the permanent improvement of housing conditions following the war.

However, since a major portion of the Nation's energies and resources must now be devoted to the war effort, it will undoubtedly be necessary to defer the inauguration of an extensive long range housing pro-

gram until the post-war period. If such a program is properly planned in advance it can provide a major source of employment and industrial activity which will help to cushion the shock of conversion from a war to a peace-time economy.

It is possible that the extent of necessary governmental subsidy will be much less than is now anticipated. Some significant experimentation has been going on in the field of prefabrication and other methods of low-cost house construction. Henry Ford put millions of low income families

on wheels by utilizing the principles of mass production. Perhaps through the employment of similar methods private capital will devise means for putting these families into decent houses.

Regardless of the way in which it is financed the dividends to be realized from a rural housing program will be enormous although they may not be the type of dividends that can be deposited in a bank. The real returns from such an investment will be the increased health and happiness of millions of farm families.

Agrarian Conflicts In New York and the American Revolution

*By Irving Mark**

ABSTRACT

What is the relation to the American Revolution of feudal or other oppressive aspects of the New York land system? Feudal forms in colonial New York existed though they were neither extensive nor profound in influence; on the other hand, phases of the land system, not strictly feudal, were. Thus an oppressive economic dependence was reflected in small farmer obligations and insecure tenure. Furthermore, the concentration of land ownership nurtured a landed aristocracy who flourished in a congenial legal and political milieu in which monopoly of land and office was securely maintained. Of these possible seeds of agrarian unrest, only the non-feudal ones sprouted into violence in colonial New York. Yet neither feudal nor other oppressive characteristics of the land system were conditioning factors producing the Revolution insofar as New York was concerned. Although otherwise caused, the Revolution had undeniable effects upon the land system, particularly in sweeping away lingering feudal forms though not the continuing oppression of the small-farmer.

Qué relación hay entre la Revolución Americana y los aspectos feudales o de otro modo opresivos del sistema de posesión de la tierra en el estado de Nueva York? Las formas feudales existían en la Nueva York colonial, aunque no tuvieran influencias extensas o profundas; por otra parte, algunas fases del sistema de posesión de la tierra que no eran exactamente feudales, sí tuvieron una influencia extensa y profunda. Así vemos reflejarse en las obligaciones y la posesión de la tierra que no eran exactamente feudales, sí tuvieron una influencia extensa y profunda. Así vemos reflejarse en las obligaciones y la posesión insegura de los pequeños terratenientes una dependencia económica

* Department of History, Brooklyn College.

opresiva. Además, la concentración de la posesión de la tierra produjo una aristocracia terrateniente que se desarrolló en un medio legal y político favorable, en el cual el monopolio de las tierras y la burocracia estaban completamente asegurados. De estos posibles gérmenes de inquietud agraria sólo el no-feudal se desarrolló hasta llegar a la violencia en la Nueva York colonial. Sin embargo, ninguno de estos rasgos opresivos (feudales o no,) característicos del sistema de posesión de la tierra, contribuyó a los factores que produjeron la revolución, al menos en lo que concierne al estado de Nueva York. Aunque causada por otros factores, la revolución tuvo efectos innegables en el sistema de posesión de la tierra, especialmente en el abandono de formas feudales que aun quedaban, aunque no en el de la opresión de los pequeños terratenientes que continuó.

The great revolutions in seventeenth century England and eighteenth century France have been viewed as flowing in the long-gathered flood that submerged feudalism insofar as they marked the termination of vestigial feudal rights.¹ This conception suggests the interesting speculation of the extent to which the American Revolution found itself in the same eddying currents. Some, indeed, have contended that our Revolution was in part the culmination of a century-long conflict to destroy feudal forms of American land tenure. Viewing the quit-rent "not only as a feature of colonial land tenure and legislation, but as a contributory cause also to the discontent which brought on the Revolution," Professor Charles M. Andrews wrote in 1919 that it "involved a principle quite as fundamental as that of no taxation without representation and one that probably had more actual influence in bringing about independence than some of the widely heralded political and constitutional doctrines of the pre-Revolutionary period."² In this view Andrews has apparently been in accord with B. W. Bond who wrote of the quit-rent that "this feudal due may be considered

as one at least of the causes of that growing discontent, which culminated in revolt from the mother country."³

Tempting and provocative as this thesis is, it would be the better part of discretion to narrow the focus and range of our investigation before we rush in where scholars fear to tread. No adequate treatment of the total problem can be given until monographs on all the colonies are available concerning the nature of the land system, the agrarian conflicts that ensued, and the relationships of these conflicts to the American revolutionary process. With materials available on one colony, it is not premature to examine the New York segment of the larger mosaic, however vague the latter may remain.⁴

In scouting the problem of whether the agrarian conflicts in colonial New York⁵ were a conditioning factor for the American Revolution, one must consider several permutations of derivative questions. These questions involve combinations of specific and general meanings of terms with active and passive poles of the causal process. The term feudalism or feudal forms in one sense has specific reference to a decentralized policy and a

land system dominated by a landed aristocracy and involving military tenures or fiefs, vassalage, quit-rents, manors, manorial courts, serfdom, and primo-geniture and entail.⁶ Too frequently, political and land systems without these attributes but with oppressive and monopolistic aspects have been called in a general, and none too accurate, sense "feudal."⁷ In any case, agrarian conflicts might arise from one as well as from the other. Our first problem is to determine to what extent, if any, the land system of colonial New York was "feudal" in the more specific sense noted above. Even slight findings here will not preclude the possibility that agrarian controversies arising from a non-feudal land system might have been a conditioning factor for the American Revolution. Furthermore, if our inquiry indicates no substantial basis in fact for such a possibility we would still have to consider how the New York land system in its feudal aspects was itself affected by that Revolution.

Mention should be made of the view that feudal institutions were never fully established in America. "Thus the origins of America and the development of its early institutions," writes L. M. Hacker, "are to be found in the age of the revolutionary upthrust of the middle class; and the uniqueness of some of our national experiences can in a measure be explained in terms of the absence of the vestigial traces of a feudal society."⁸ Yet it seems clear that efforts, however impermanent, were made to establish feudal forms in Maryland,

Carolina, New York, and elsewhere.⁹ What factors militated against the success of such efforts? To the reason noted above should be added the abundance of land and the sturdy opposition to proprietors by planters and by yeomen, whose labor was always at a premium. Only the quit-rents partially survived their onslaught.¹⁰

In New York the attempt to establish feudalism proved incomplete and abortive. Whatever intentions the Duke of York had to establish a feudal land system in New York, he certainly never succeeded in nurturing vassalage or serfdom. Yet he did create "manors" after the English conquest, a status which was conferred upon the sole surviving patroonship of Rensselaerswyck (1685), the Dutch prototype of the English manorial grants.¹¹ Whether the Duke, who received New York "in free and Common Socage," was validly endowed with power to establish feudal manors as were the Carolina and Maryland proprietors under their "Durham" clauses, is a moot question.¹² Yet, that the Duke never considered *Quia Emptores* and the Statute of 1660, destroying subinfeudation and feudal tenures,¹³ barriers to establishing New York manors, is apparent from the prompt creation of Pell, Sylvester, and Winthrop Manors.¹⁴ The confirmation of Rensselaerswyck as a manor (1704), and the granting of Livingston (1686), Philipsborough (1693), and Cortlandt Manors (1697), and of others soon followed when Dongan, Fletch-

er, and other governors pursued the trail blazed by Nicolls.¹⁵

Basing his analysis on the patents and charters, a recent authority has concluded that the legal and political aspects of New York manors were feudal. Within the stricter sense of the term feudalism, what feudal aspects did these manors actually have? The "privileges and immunities" conferred, reflecting an intention to establish local jurisdiction, were suggestive of the decentralization that characterized medieval polity.¹⁶ Even the Dutch grant of 1629 to Van Rensselaer had given him (besides ownership of the soil, the right of escheat, and hunting, fishing and milling rights) unlimited criminal jurisdiction over the lives of inhabitants and the right of appointment of magistrates and clergymen. The one court which Van Rensselaer was authorized to have, in 1665 merged with that of Fort Orange. However, the patent of 1685 provided for "one Courte Leete and one court baron."¹⁷ Thus the basis for a system of local courts under the landlord's control, which supplemented the courts of the colonial authorities, was established.

All the New York patents creating manors, except the Lloyd grant, which called for "One Court leete" only, authorized the establishment of leet courts and courts baron.¹⁸ Yet, since there is extant only one record of a notice of appeal (from Fordham manor court),¹⁹ no conclusion can be sufficiently sustained on the exercise of power to create manorial courts save that they were not thriving institutions. It is probable that courts

baron existed prior to 1691 though not after, and that leet court franchises were not exercised at all.²⁰ Thus, obsolescent manor courts arose too late to withstand the increasing efficiency of town and county administration.²¹ If their formal existence bowed to higher forces, their spirit lingered on endowing manorial lords with the substance of political and economic power expressed through other channels.

The local rights and privileges peculiar to the manors were varied in character. Their defensive purpose was reflected in their military burdens which were similar to those of the town.²² Although the authority of governor and legislature, and of sheriff and county, extended to the manor in matters above manorial jurisdiction, the manor lord's consent seems to have been required to permit the entrance of justices of peace and of constables.²³ In 1684 Francis Romboult (Rombouts), a former Mayor of New York City, had to petition the governor to get John Pell to pay a debt because the patent to Pell had freed him from all but the governor's jurisdiction.²⁴ Frederick Philipse's charter to Philipsborough, authorizing the erection of King's Bridge over Spuyten Duyvil, conferred the unique right of collecting tolls. These privileges and immunities together with "the Advowson and right of Patronage" of churches, were bestowed upon manorial lords.²⁵ Furthermore, three great manors, Rensselaersyck, Livingston, and Cortlandt, were each authorized to have one extra representative in the colonial assembly.²⁶

In addition to these powers, the reservation of quit-rents to the crown suggests the feudal nature of New York grants, whether manorial or not. The quit-rent was at first a commutation in money of certain medieval villein obligations but later, "any form of payment, which absolved or made quit the tenant, whether vassal, freeholder, copyholder, or leaseholder, in respect of personal service or other similar obligation to the lord."²⁷ Yet, when the meagreness of the burden is contrasted with the hugeness of the patents, the quit-rents appear more significant as an indication of royal favor rather than of obligation. Thus, Van Cortlandt's 86,000 acres called for 40s. per annum; Philipse's 156,000 acres, £4 12s.; Livingston's 150,000 acres, 28s.; and Rensselaerswyck's 1,000,000 acres, 50 bushels of wheat.²⁸ Indeed, the disparity between these token payments, which were not always made, and the value received led to the charge of fraud.²⁹

Despite the smallness of quit-rents, laxity in their payment prevailed, provoking hostile comments and actions of colonial officials. Governor Dongan tried to force recalcitrant patentees to have their grants confirmed with quit-rents included.³⁰ After Governor Bellomont, with a few exceptions, a quit-rent of two shillings and six pence was required for every hundred acres until 1774, when it was reduced to a half-penny. Officials like Lieutenant-Governor Colden had frequently charged that the quit-rents were too small. Archibald Kennedy, the first Receiver-

General who really tried to collect quit-rents in New York, met the stubborn opposition of the Assembly. In 1761 he managed to collect £800, though both Governor Moore and General Gage agreed in 1767 that the total should have been £1,800 per annum with £19,000 in arrears.³¹ It was a tribute to the power of the landholders in the colonial legislature that efforts before the Revolution to change this feeble quit-rent system were of no avail.³² Significantly, an obligation so generally and conveniently evaded did not, quite naturally, provoke intense attack.

Thus, it may be concluded that the surviving feudal aspects of colonial New York were neither extensive in their character nor profound in their influence. For they comprised little beyond the manorial lord's local political power, and certain characteristics of the land system like the quit-rents and the rule of primogeniture, of which more will be said later.

If, in a strict sense, New York "feudalism" was rather tenuous and impermanent, nevertheless the economic dependence of small farmers upon their landlords was substantial and lasting. Indeed, only in terms of such dependence can the up-risings upon the estates of the Livingstons, the Philipses, the Van Cortlandts, and the Van Rensselaers be adequately understood. For even non-manorial patents gave economic power to grantees. In either case they owned freehold estates, estates of inheritance, usually of huge dimensions, for which they were obliged to pay only small quit-rents. By 1750

the existence of printed forms of conveyances, when printing was not common, suggests that they were free to grant or lease property on their own terms. In any case, small farmers were generally dependent throughout Hudson Valley manors and patents. Not without reason did Bellomont speak of the "vassallage" of New York farmers and Colden think that they were "in no manner superior to the common farmers in England."³³

In general the landed proprietors favored a tenant-farmer system similar to that in England. To that end they advertised holdings for rent rather than for sale.³⁴ This policy and the terms of their grants or leases corresponded to Governor Tryon's defence of land grants to men of weight: "They will naturally farm out their lands to Tenants; a method which will ever create subordination and counterpoise, in some measure, the general levelling spirit. . . ."³⁵ The terms under which New York tillers of manors and patents held land varied widely even when title was derived from the same landlord, and especially when from different landlords.

Eighteenth century conveyances of freehold estates, whether made by manorial lords or patentees, generally reserved enough rights for them to prevent small farmers from acquiring completely untrammelled fees.³⁶ Thus the Van Rensselaers and the Philipse, in the Highland Patent, commonly granted "durable leases" with a reservation of a "perpetual rent" payable annually in kind or in

specie.³⁷ For example, Philip Philipse's "lease" to Moss Kent on August 1, 1766 conveyed a "fee farm" of one hundred and eighteen acres for thirty-one pounds in hand and an eight pound perpetual rent to Philipse. The Livingstons and the Philipse, in Philipsborough, achieved the same end with life estates measured by two persons in being, occasionally by one or three lives.³⁸ A few Livingston grants were "durable leases" with "perpetual rents."³⁹ Furthermore, most Philipsborough "tenants," to whom Philipse seems never to have sold an acre of his inheritance, held their life estates without benefit of any written conveyances.⁴⁰ Only in Cortlandt Manor, after the division of the estates was completed in 1753, did the landlords appear willing to convert term leases and life estates into fees simple, an improvement which was not consummated until the Revolutionary period.⁴¹

Besides this niggardly sales policy, these landlords generally reserved many other rights. Such were the milling and mining rights. Alienation fees like the quarter, third, or half-sale which entitled grantors to corresponding portions of the sales price when estates were sold, were common to all their conveyances except Van Cortlandts'. Improvements accrued to landlords, and could be sold only with consent and upon payment of alienation fees. Accumulation of such fees frequently exceeded the value of the fee simple itself. In Philipsborough conveyances, which were invariably oral, bequests could be made only "with permission of

Col. Frederick Philipse,"⁴² and rents could be raised, though it was not clear whether ejectments against tenants could be had.⁴³ In all conveyances, non-fulfillment of obligations entitled the landlords to rights of distraint under which they could re-enter and retake possession. Some deeds provided for labor service with horses and obliged grantees to pay the royal quit-rents.

Eighteenth century term leases contained similar provision. Their varying terms ranged from one year Livingston leases through longer Livingston, Van Rensselaer, and Van Cortlandt ones. Prior to the 1760's farmers on Philipsborough and Cortlandt Manor were mostly tenants holding estates less than freeholds.⁴⁴ The provisions for rents in kind (wheat or fowl) suggested a metayage or share-cropping system; work-service with horses for several days each year, *corvées*. Livingston leases after the 1750's, like those of Rensselaerswyck and Cortlandt Manor, contained clauses making the tenant responsible for taxes. Thus Robert G. Livingston's printed forms obliged tenants to pay the rent set, "which Rent is to be paid without any Deduction or Abatement of or for any Manner of Taxes, Charges, Assessments or Impositions whatsoever, . . ."⁴⁵ Finally the right of distraint forced the tenant's compliance with the lease.

On Rensselaerswyck, Cortlandt and Livingston Manors, and Philipsborough, the small farmers had certain additional obligations which were peculiar to the manor, though no-

where did the institution of serfdom emerge. As indicated above, they had to submit to whatever survived of manorial jurisdiction.⁴⁶ Their economic dependence facilitated the lord's use of his manor as a rotten borough in the election of a manorial representative to the Assembly.⁴⁷ The personal services required (usually three days service with wagoned horses) were more detailed and reservations of rights frequently more onerous than on the patents. For example, early Van Rensselaer conveyances included tithes, and prohibitions against fur trading and against housing strangers without permission, although these terms were obsolete by the eighteenth century.⁴⁸ Manorial lords reserved the rights of cutting timber, of collecting fees for making roads and of advowson. For these reasons, where the landlord's character and policy did not intervene, lesser grantees or tenants generally viewed the manor and its lord as more obnoxious than the patented estate and its proprietor. But in either case, insecurity of tenure hung like a spectre over their farms, blighting any ambitious projects. For what did it help farmers to improve their farms only to be faced ultimately by the alternative of paying more rent or of surrendering the farm and its improvements?⁴⁹

The concentration of land in the hands of a few encouraged the development of a landed aristocracy, feudal or otherwise. High within its ranks, corresponding to the vastness of their domains, stood the Van Rensselaers, Philipses, Livingstons, Van

Cortlandts, and land speculators like the Banyars and Duanes.⁵⁰ Excepting Cortlandt Manor, their acquisitions in the Hudson Valley and Green Mountain regions were not entirely free from statutory evasions, fraud of Indians, and vague metes and bounds which tainted many colonial land transactions.⁵¹ If tenants and settlers on these estates were not moved primarily by the inequitable distribution of land and by the circumstances surrounding its acquisition, they certainly utilized these as occasions for improving their own economic status at the expense of landlords and speculators.

The landed aristocracy flourished in a congenial legal milieu which securely maintained their concentrated holdings. Neither extant real property law nor the political mechanism for changing or ameliorating it offered any relief to the tenant farmer. For the law covered landlords, though not the tenants, with the mantle of secure tenure. Statutes made dubious titles certain; a recording system, which was of special concern to large landowners, kept titles clear.⁵² Furthermore, the law of inheritance of an intestate's realty through entails and primogeniture, favored the development and maintenance of a landed aristocracy. In 1683 the first colonial assembly of New York resolved: "That from hence forward Noe Lands Within this province shall be Esteemed or accounted a Chattle, or personal Estate but an Estate of Inheritance according to the Custome and practice of his Majesties Realme of England."⁵³ Stephan Van Cort-

landt's will providing for an equal division of his estate amongst his eleven children was the exception rather than the rule in the eighteenth century.⁵⁴ More usual was the will of Frederick Philipse which devised an entail made in accordance with the rule of primogeniture.⁵⁵ Thus did a practice springing from feudal times prevail in colonial New York.

The inherent danger in consolidating large inheritances in few hands disturbed many colonial minds. The dread of land aggrandizement, which must have weighed heavily, though inarticulately, upon small farmer victims of the practice, found expression amongst landlords themselves. In 1733 Cadwallader Colden presented a forceful memorial to the Governor of New York in favor of small estates and fees. However, it was not until 1782 that the estate tail was converted into a fee simple absolute; and primogeniture based upon the canon of descents of England, transformed into partible inheritance, in which all the issue of equal degree shared alike.⁵⁶ But not even then did laws cease to add the weight of their dignity to an inequitable land system.⁵⁷ Nor was the hand that held the plough the one that wrote the laws.

The landed aristocracy, propped by these legal advantages, jealously guarded its privileged status. Even Bellomont proved of little avail against the commanding political role that the landed elite played in colonial New York. Of the one hundred and thirty-seven governors, councilors, assemblymen, judges, and

lawyers from about 1750 to 1776, one hundred and ten, eighty per cent, were large landholders, or related to such families; six were small landowners; and twenty-one, fifteen per cent, held even smaller holdings or no land at all.⁵⁸ Against such extensive landlord power, what prospect of improvement did the small farmers have in an appeal to executive, legislative, or judicial remedies?

Landlord dominance in politics was assured in various ways. The lowest stratum of society was barred from the electorate and from the juries, through property qualifications. Indeed, even the enfranchised farmers were frequently unable to counteract the pressure that the landlords could exert through their pocket boroughs, which in several cases had extra representation in the Assembly.⁵⁹ In defense of their interests, the great landlords branded the aspirations of the poorer farmers as "New England republicanism"; yet with no less zeal did they defend the common law against the possibility of the Crown's encroachment upon their land through chancery.⁶⁰ Against the landlords' political dominance small farmers had neither the power to shape laws nor the wealth to sustain the expense of judicial redress. Such were the conditions which determined the phases of agrarian discontent.

The closing of all peaceful avenues forced small farmers to violent action to better their economic status. Although they seized upon any convenient occasion to do so, significantly they nowhere explicitly directed their

energy against the "feudal forms" which have been specified above. Rather did they seek to acquire land. Such was the quest of the Palatines in 1711 and thereafter when, charging bad faith, they followed Conrad Weiser, Jacob Sharp, and Christophel Hagadorn in violent opposition to Governor Hunter.⁶¹

To acquire security of tenure and lower rents the embattled tenants of Livingston, Van Rensselaer and Philipse welcomed revived Indians claims and rival Massachusetts titles. Throughout the '50's and '60's they conducted a fierce anti-rent war culminating in Prendergast's Rebellion of 1766, in which the Cortlandt tenants joined. The Philipse tenants forsook their landlords' titles in order to buy from rival Indian claimants absolute fees or 999 year leaseholds.⁶² The rebel leader, William Prendergast, sought to secure for his followers equitable rights to the land. He advocated violence declaring farmers "could not be defended in a Court of Law because they were poore therefore they were determined to do them [selves] Justice [and] that poor Men were always oppressed by the Rich."⁶³

The rebels of '66 were called "levelers" because they withheld rents to enforce their demands for secure tenure and lower rents. This "levelling" tendency reminds one of the "natural rights" of New Jersey anti-renters who contended, "No man is naturally intitled to a greater Proportion of the Earth, than another. . . ." and of Shaysites who were urged to support those rights to which "the God of

nature hath intitled" them.⁶⁴ But in a very significant manner the New York uprisings differed from them. For the Jersey yeoman, who brought his New England love of absolute freeholds with him to Elizabethtown and Perth Amboy, was waging a struggle against a vestigial feudal right, the quit-rent. Furthermore, Shays's rebellion, like the Connecticut "levelling" movement in 1766, expressed anti-creditor as well as anti-landlord feeling. On the other hand, Prendergast always insisted that all debts except those for rent be paid in full though execution was to be levied upon the appraised property of the debtor and not upon his person.⁶⁵

From the 1760's through the 1780's the New Hampshire Grant settlers waged a bitter struggle to secure land on the present site of Vermont. They used a disputed boundary as a pretext for making common cause with Yankee speculators to save their homes from New York landgrabbers. Although the Allens invoked republicanism to move the reluctant against the absentee landlords of "monarchical" New York, nowhere were feudal forms the explicit object of attack. Indeed, the Allens' republican principles accommodated themselves nicely to their landed interests in the Onion River Company in which they had gambled their fortune against the validity of New York titles. Being without means to finance any compromise, they saw no possible conclusion save that of victory over New York. On a more modest scale the settler-farmer had an economic stake in preferring the more favorable terms

which the interloping Yankee speculators were prepared to offer.⁶⁶

This survey of the causes of various agrarian uprisings in colonial New York shows that they arose from non-feudal aspects of the land system. Such feudal attributes as survived the seventeenth century were never the explicit objects of complaints. "Prior to the Revolution," writes B. W. Bond, "no outward evidences of hostility toward the principle of a quit-rent appeared in the crown colonies."⁶⁷ Nor was any shown against the principle of primogeniture. The small farmer sought land in secure tenure at low cost. Failing to attain these ends in a land system that was oppressive and monopolistic, he unsuccessfully tried to do so through violent uprising. Did he participate in the American Revolution in the hope of eradicating feudal vestiges or of acquiring secure and cheap holdings?

No specific evidence has been adduced to show that anti-feudalism has played any part in accounting for the small farmer's participation in the American Revolution. Nor is this strange in view of the absence of this factor in the agrarian disturbances that preceded the Revolution. Even B. W. Bond admits that "the difficulty of ascertaining the sentiments of the people in the various colonies makes it almost impossible to furnish any accurate estimate of the extent to which the quit-rents constituted one of the main causes of the American Revolution."⁶⁸ In New York especially, where the quit-rent was retained as a nominal charge due the state,

hostility to this feudal remnant was not very intense and therefore could not possibly have contributed much to the outbreak of the Revolution.⁶⁹ To argue thus is not refuted by the contention that "the quit-rent in the domain of real property, like the royal prerogative in the field of government and the navigation acts in the field of commerce, was an obstacle to complete colonial independence, and a check upon the ability of a people to utilize its own resources for its own benefit and advantage."⁷⁰ For New York indifference to the nominal quit-rent and British laxity in its administration never produced sufficient friction to kindle the blaze. If anti-feudalism did not condition the forces leading to the American Revolution, then to what extent did the early agrarian controversies do so?

The evidence in point in New York seems to preclude any definitive and simple answer. It is difficult to accept the thesis that the Revolution was the continuation of the struggle of the patriot frontiersmen and yeomen against Tory landlords in the colonies.⁷¹ In the first place the landlords of the Hudson Valley were split on the basic issues of the day. If the roster of loyalists, who paid for their loyalty with their estates, included the Philipses, Roger Morris, DeLanceys, Johnsons, and Coldens, the patriot rolls included the Livingston, Van Rensselaers, Schuylers, and Philip and Pierre Van Cortlandt.⁷²

In the second place, loyalties cut across class lines as far as the small farmers were concerned. It has gen-

erally been assumed that small farmers were not loyalist.⁷³ But there are at least two notable exceptions, enough to give pause to this thesis. One of these occurred in the Carolinas where the Regulators, who more fervently hated the planter patriots, the victors of Alamance, were active Tories. The other involved New York where Toryism was extensive amongst small farmers as Alexander C. Flick has shown in his conclusion that the Tory emigrants to Nova Scotia "consisted mostly of disbanded loyalist soldiers, farmers," and others.⁷⁴

More significantly, the small farmers of Albany, Dutchess, and Westchester Counties, which had been the scenes of agrarian disturbances in the '50's and '60's, had a large Tory contingent.⁷⁵ Viewing all three counties, the list of judgments against loyalists shows that most were against yeomen: 153 out of 267, 57 per cent, adjudged in Albany County; 47 out of 65, 72 per cent, in Westchester; and 28 out of 56, 50 per cent, in Dutchess. Furthermore, the distribution by counties of judgments against all 358 convicted small farmers of the state was 153, 43 per cent, in Albany; 47, 13 per cent, in Westchester; and 28, 8 per cent in Dutchess. The last two counties were exceeded only by Tryon with 81 or 23 per cent of the total yeomen defendants.⁷⁶ During the last three months of 1776 two hundred and thirty-one loyalists from Dutchess and Albany Counties were sent into New Hampshire for safekeeping since the New York jails were overcrowded.⁷⁷ The

lists of non-signers of the General Association and of Tories examined at Kingston reveal many loyalists in Dutchess, especially in Livingston Manor.⁷⁸

When Prendergast was pardoned, the small farmers viewed the King as a shield against rapacious landlords. To what extent did this sentiment affect the political affiliations of small farmers, at least where patriot landlord families like the Van Rensselaers and Livingstons were concerned? Almost a score of Tories were found whose names and residences suggest relationship to those active in agrarian disturbances: Benjamin Baker, Christian Crow, Arent and Casper M. Hallenbeck, David Ingersoll, Anthony and Stephen Miller, Samuel Munroe, Benjamin Noble, William Prendergrast (*sic*), Andries Rees, Thomas Robinson, John Stewart, Nathan Whitney, Hazard and Stephen Wilcox, and Jonathan Wright.⁷⁹ The toryism that was rampant in Westchester County was supported by small farmers. There the 1766 upheaval probably hastened land reforms giving greater security of tenure even before the Revolution. Anxious to preserve the new economic *status quo*, many Westchester small farmers embraced toryism.⁸⁰

How the land system and agrarian revolts affected the alignment of the small farmer with Patriots and Tories may be roughly sketched from a few other circumstances. Although the bulk of the small farmers in the New Hampshire Grant region were "whiggish" in their politics their leaders were willing to deal with the

enemy during the Revolution when such tactics would help secure recognition of their landed interests against New York. The Allens, Baker, Bradley, and Chittenden, coming from "republican" Connecticut,⁸¹ viewed with contempt New York's unwillingness to support the non-intercourse agreement of the Continental Congress. Moreover, Ethan Allen had delivered himself of disquisitions on social compact. "Laws and society compacts," ran his message to Governor Tryon in 1772, "were made to protect and secure the subjects, in their peaceable possessions and properties, and not to subvert them."⁸² News of Concord and Lexington evoked from Ethan the declaration of his "sincere passion for liberty" and his "philosophical horror" of the perpetual slavery which threatened to engulf America.⁸³

Indeed somewhat before the taking of Fort Ticonderoga, which commanded the approaches to the 60,829 acres of his Onion River Company, Ethan Allen had assured John Brown, an agent of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, that he would take the fort as soon as hostilities commenced.⁸⁴ Yet when their newly established state of Vermont was faced with dangers, chiefly from New York and Great Britain, to protect their landed interests and political independence, the Allens entered into involved negotiations with Great Britain.⁸⁵ Correspondence on exchange of prisoners, called treasonable by some, seemed to include a British expectation of Vermont's return to allegiance, although it is

doubtful if Vermont ever really intended more than a ruse.⁸⁶

In these tortuous dealings, one thing emerges crystal clear. The small farmers of Vermont and their speculative leaders were mostly concerned with the acquisition of land. And if Britain would serve to beat reluctant New York and the Continental Congress into accepting Yankee landed interests, then the settlers and their speculator allies were prepared to forego, at least temporarily, their republican principles in dubious maneuvers with the Crown. Indeed, on several occasions, Britain's attention was called to the possibility of exploiting small farmer discontent against patriot landlords. At least two proposals were considered for buying imprisoned Ethan's support with a command of a regiment and with assurances of retention of his land titles.⁸⁷ Moreover, a spy wrote of Ethan Allen that he might be:

made usefull to the Government by giving him and his adherents the property of all the Lands appropriated to Rebels and making that Country a Separate Government dependant on the Crown.⁸⁸

Furthermore, John Watts, in an excellent position to understand the land situation, recommended a British policy of *divide et impera* in which six thousand tenant-farmers might be induced to turn against the great patriot-landlords like the Van Rensselaers, the Livingstons, and Philip and Pierre Van Cortlandt. In

a letter to the British Ministry referring to the estates of some of these landlords, he recommended that their grants be vacated and:

that all the present tenants be free from their vassalage, and that every one may be a freeholder of such farm and premises which he now holds for ever, on condition that they not only return to their allegiance to the King, but that they in person take up arms, and assist his Majesty in reducing the rebels to subjection.⁸⁹

Thus the thesis that the struggle against feudalism or against an oppressive land system was a conditioning factor accounting for the American Revolution seems to be refuted at least insofar as New York is concerned. In the face of the foregoing refutation it would seem more reasonable to seek the explanation of the Revolution in New York in other, and more valid hypotheses. Space, however, does not permit presentation of an explanation which corresponds more closely to the known relevant facts.⁹⁰

If the New Hampshire Grant and Hudson Valley situations do not support the refuted thesis, nevertheless the Revolution had a profound effect upon the land system of New York. For one thing, it gave the *coup de grâce* to those feudal forms which had not died with the manorial courts. The Revolution abolished entail and primogeniture, both of which had hindered division of many great estates like Livingston Manor. Thus

an absolute fee tail became an unconditional fee simple, and real property of intestates descended in equal parts to all the children of the blood of the deceased. Feudal obligations like wardships, fines for alienation, charges for knight's service, scutage, relief, and aids were swept away and all feudal tenures like those held directly of the Crown or of knight's service, were made "allodial." Quit-rents were vested in the State in 1779 and their commutation allowed in 1786 by the payment of fourteen times the value of the annual quit-rent. All arrears in quit-rents up to September 29, 1783 were remitted. Manors were broken up and estates of loyalist proprietors and tenants confiscated.⁹¹

Yet despite these changes, the land system, propped by the constitution of 1777, was not very materially changed so far as the small farmer was concerned.⁹² Thus, although alienation fees had been formally abolished, quarter-sales in fact persisted until 1846. The predominance of large scale landowners led a shrewd foreign observer to plan a tract in 1784 "on the necessity of establishing some *Agrarian Laws* in America to prevent *Monopolies of Land*. . . ."⁹³ The small farmers merely continued a policy begun before the Revolution. Yet, many patriot tenants on these confiscated loyalist estates found themselves unable or unwilling to use their pre-emption right to buy back the lands and improvements in their possession and were consequently ejected.⁹⁴ Furthermore, the tenants of Van Rensselaer and Livingston in Albany and

Dutchess Counties continued to complain of grievances in agitation that persisted through Shays's rebellion, the struggle over the Federal Constitution, and the anti-rent movement of the 1840's.⁹⁵

The conclusions that can be drawn from this survey can only have reference to New York. Quite naturally they must be stated subject to qualifications that would undoubtedly be necessary when the other colonies have been similarly analyzed. While the American Revolution fits into the pattern of early modern anti-feudalism so far as its effects are concerned, the struggle against feudal forms was not integrally related to the causes of that revolution. Even in this respect it differed from the French Revolution where the *cahiers de doléances* explicitly reveal that struggle's direction against what remained of feudalism. Perhaps it is futile to present any conclusions limited to a given region since the problem of causation can only be adequately considered in the total setting of the thirteen colonies and their relationships to England. Thus, the conclusions for New York should not discourage continued effort to test for the colonies as a whole the general theme with which we began.

⁹¹L. M. Hacker, *The Triumph of American Capitalism* (New York, 1940), pp. 76-81; A. Mathiez, *The French Revolution* (New York, 1929), pp. 39, 52-7, 194-5; L. Gershoy, *The French Revolution and Napoleon* (New York, 1933), esp. pp. 43-6, 121-4, 160-4, 225-6, 258, 310.

⁹²B. W. Bond, *The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies* (New Haven, 1919), p. 11. In fairness to Professor Andrews, who has graciously answered my letter to him on the matter, his present view should

be noted that the sentence as it stands is misleading. Though he still thinks the quit-rent has its place among the secondary causes leading to colonial discontent, he does not believe that it, or feudalism, was a major general cause.

⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 458-59.

¹⁰I. Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711-1775* (New York, 1940), one of the *Columbia Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, contains relevant materials, especially in chapter two and in the concluding remarks.

¹¹For agrarian conflicts referred to see Mark, *op. cit.*, chaps. 4-6.

¹²Aware of the conflict over the definition of the term feudalism, we have not defined it. We have simply noted elements within our use of a term which has been held to include the agrarian economy presupposed by feudal tenure. Furthermore, we have formulated our questions in terms of the land system because little else of feudalism has much application to New York by the eighteenth century. G. B. Adams, *The Origins of the English Constitution* (New Haven, 1920), pp. 50-4, and his *Civilization During the Middle Ages* (New York, 1907), chap. 9. *Per contra*, Carl Stephenson, "The Origin and Significance of Feudalism," *The American Historical Review*, XLVI (1941), 788-812, esp. pp. 789, 795, 797, 808. C. M. Andrews, seeing some justification for using the term "feudalism" in the broader connotation of medieval tenure, is of the opinion that "In the narrower sense of the word, neither socage tenure nor quit-rent was feudal." Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

¹³The following seem to use the term "feudal" in a very general sense. F. L. Pope, "The Western Boundary of Massachusetts, a Study of Indian and Colonial History," *Berkshire Historical and Scientific Collections*, I (1892), 30; L. Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution* (2 vols., Boston, 1864), I, 28; A. Bingham and A. J. Colvin, *A Treatise on Rents, Real and Personal Covenants and Conditions* (Albany, 1857), p. 18.

¹⁴L. M. Hacker, "Revolutionary America an Interpretation of Our History," *Harpers*, March, 1935, pp. 434-5.

¹⁵H. L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols., New York, 1904-7), Vol. II, chap. 1; II, 5 *et seq.*; III, 15; W. MacDonald, ed., *Select Characters and Other Documents Illustrative of American History 1606-1775* (New York, 1904), pp. 53-59, 120-5, 149-168; The charters of Maine and Pennsylvania, though the latter lacked a "Durham clause," allowed the erection of manors. *Vide n.* 12. Cf. C. P. Nettels, *The Roots of American Civilization* (New York, 1939), pp. 181-2.

¹⁶L. G. Tyler, *England in America 1580-1652* (New York, 1904), chap. 7; E. McCrady, *History of South Carolina under the Proprietary Government 1670-1719* (New York, 1901), pp. 103 *et seq.*; Osgood, *op. cit.*, II, 14-15; Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16, 20, 32 *et seq.*

¹⁷E. B. O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland* (2 vols., New York, 1846-48), I, 121-28, 199, 238-9, 257-58, 365, 382-83; II, 426, 551; C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Period of American History* (4 vols., New Haven, 1934-38), III, 83-84, n. 5; S. G. Nissenon, *The Patroon's Domain* (New York, 1937), pp. 329-32.

¹⁸*Vide n.* 9. Cf. B. P. Poore, *The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters and other Organic Laws of the United States* (2 vols., Washington, 1877), I, 776, 777, 780; II, 1383, 1384; *Colonial Laws of New York from the Year 1664 to the Revolution* (5 vols., Albany, 1894), I, 2.

¹⁹Statute of Westminster III, 18 Edw. I, c. 1 (1290), *Quia Emptores*; Statute of 1660, 12 Car. II, c. 24, which converted feudal tenures into those of free and common socage. For discussion and bibliography, see J. Goebel, *Some Legal and Political Aspects of the Manors of New York* (Baltimore, 1928), pp. 9-11; Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, nn. 13, 18. *Per contra*, E. F. De Lancey, "Origin and History of Manors" in J. T. Scharf, *History of Westchester County, New York* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1886), I, 79, 85-90; R. L. Fowler, *History of the Law of Real Property in New York* (New York, 1895), pp. 30-32.

²⁰J. R. Brodhead, *History of the State of New York* (2 vols., New York, 1859-1871), II, 107-8; M. Schuyler, *The Patroons and Lords of Manors of the Hudson* (Baltimore, 1932), map *post* p. 32; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 156.

²¹Goebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-22. Professor Goebel thinks "it is entirely immaterial for the understanding of the American manors to know how the English manor came about and how it developed." It is important to understand merely what men thought of it in the seventeenth century. *Ibid.*, p. 7. Cf. Osgood, *op. cit.*, II, 5 *et seq.*; III, 15.

²²R. L. Fowler holds that manors were "intended to continue to be the nuclei of colonization, and to afford a ready-made local government of the colonists in distant and almost inaccessible regions of the new country." *Facsimile of the Laws . . . of New York . . . by William Bradford* (New York, 1894), p. xcvi.

²³A. J. F. Van Laer, *Van Rensselaer Bowier MSS* (Albany, 1908), pp. 136-153, and his *Minutes of the Court of Fort Orange and Beverwyck, 1652-1660* (2 vols.,

Albany, 1920-23), I, 9; *Colonial Records, General Entries, 1664-1665*, p. 119.

¹⁸M. L. Woolsey, *The Lloyd Manor of Queens Village* (Baltimore, 1925), pp. 10-11, 36. Woolsey believes that Shelter Island and Fordham were empowered to create both courts in the clause "like and equal privileges and immunities with any manor within this government." *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12. Cf. Goebel, *loc. cit.*, p. 18.

¹⁹Dated February, 1676, New York Colonial MSS, 1638-1800 (103 vols., N. Y. State Library), XXV, 79.

²⁰Goebel admits the possibility of manor courts functioning but is wary of conclusions in the face of lack of evidence. He indicates that the courts baron were not of record, hence would leave none; that only hearsay evidence for manorial courts actually functioning exists [e. g. C. R. Street, ed., *Huntington Town Records* (3 vols., Huntington, 1887-1889), I, 423-24; D. R. Fox, *Caleb Heathcote, Gentleman Colonist* (New York, 1926), pp. 120-1; E. H. Hall, *Philipse Manor Hall at Yonkers, New York* (New York, 1912), p. 114; Carl Carmer, *The Hudson* (New York, 1939), p. 82]; and that some writers believe courts were held only in the manor on which they were writing. Goebel, *loc. cit.*, p. 19, n. 59; p. 22, n. 68. Cf. Mrs. Pierre E. Van Cortlandt, "The Van Cortlandt Family" in Scharf, *Hist. of Westchester*, II, 426.

²¹Fowler, *Facsimile of the Bradford Laws of N. Y.*, pp. 2-6; *Colonial Laws of N. Y.*, I, 43-44, 226 et seq.; Goebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21.

²²Sylvester manor bought an exemption; Livingston maintained a military company. *Colonial Laws of New York*, I, 49-55; E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *The Documentary History of the State of New York* (4 vols., Albany, 1849-51), III, 704; Goebel, *loc. cit.*, p. 15.

²³So, for Pell, Sylvester, Winthrop, and Livingston. E. W. Spaulding, *New York in the Critical Period, 1783-1789* (New York, 1932), pp. 58-59. Spaulding cites H. C. Van Schaack, *Memoirs of Henry Van Schaack* (Chicago, 1892), c. p. 151 and Van Rensselaer Leases (N. Y. State Lib.) neither of which references has led to the discovery of relevant material. This political immunity does not seem to have obtained in Rensselaerswyck by the middle of the seventeenth century where written "summons" to settle the boundaries in 1654 were ordered served on the dominal authority. E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (15 vols., Albany, 1853-1887), XIV, 256; cf. Nissen-son, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-41, 275.

²⁴*Calendar of Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York* (E. B. O'Callaghan, ed.; 2 vols.,

Albany, 1865-1866), II, 112. For Pell's Charter, Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 103-4.

²⁵From the patent of Rensselaerswyck, Nov. 4, 1685, Nissen-son, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-4; see Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 160e.

²⁶Since 1685, 1715, and 1717 respectively, Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59; E. B. Livingston, *The Livingstons of Livingston Manor* (New York, 1910), p. 111; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 124. For failure of the Van Cortlandt's to exercise their right, Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71.

²⁷Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

²⁸Spaulding, *N. Y. in Critical Period*, pp. 65-66; Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 111.

²⁹*Doc. Rel. to Col. N. Y.*, III, 493 et seq.

³⁰*Ibid.*, III, 401.

³¹*Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, I, 375-389. See also *Doc. Rel. to Col. N. Y.*, IV, 271, 327, 384, 391-92; V, 162, 368; C. Colden, *Colden Letter Books* (2 vols., New York, 1877-8), I, 362-64; Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-64; E. P. Alexander in A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York* (10 vols., New York, 1933-37), III, 155.

³²For the elaborate machinery set up by the Legislature in 1742, 1755, 1762, and 1769 to collect quit-rents, see *Colonial Laws of N. Y.*, III, 209-215, 1107-1114; IV, 584-591, 1036-38; V, 669-70. Spaulding, *op. cit.*, p. 58; Bond, *op. cit.*, pp. 404 et seq.

³³*Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, III, 629. Cf. *Doc. Rel. to Col. N. Y.*, IV, 822-23; VII, 795 et seq.

³⁴V. D. Harrington, *The New York Merchant on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1935), p. 135.

³⁵Tryon to Hillsborough, April 11, 1772, *Doc. Rel. to Col. N. Y.*, VIII, 293-94.

³⁶For fuller discussion of eighteenth century estates and their terms, Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-73.

³⁷For Van Rensselaer conveyances, see Van Rensselaer Leases (N. Y. State Lib.); Van Rensselaer—Fort Land Papers (N. Y. P. L.); Van Laer, *The Van Rensselaer Bowier MSS*, esp. pp. 746-780; *The Writings and Speeches of Samuel J. Tilden* (John Bigelow, ed.; 2 vols., New York, 1885), I, 188-194; N. Y. State, *Assembly Documents*, no. 189 (1844), VII, 19-24. For Philipse conveyances, see Philipse-Gouverneur Land Titles (Columbia U.), esp. no. 19.

³⁸Livingston conveyances may be found in Gilbert Livingston Land Papers, and in Redmond-Livingston MSS (both in N. Y. P. L.).

³⁹Similar to R. G. Livingston's grant to Darius Talman and his heirs, with a yearly rent, Gilbert Livingston Papers.

⁴⁰T. H. Bristol, "Abstracts of Sales by the Commissioners of Forfeitures in the Southern District of New York State" in *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, LIX (1928), 108; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 91;

American Loyalist Transcript (60 vols., N. Y. P. L.), XLI, 632-634; DeLancey says that all the tenants of Philipsborough were disqualified for jury service which means that they must have had estates less than freehold or freehold estates valued less than sixty pounds. *Journal of the General Assembly of N. Y.*, Nov. 21, 1769-Jan. 27, 1770, pp. 5-6, 80; *Colonial Laws of N. Y.*, III, 185, 599; cf. *ibid.*, I, 387, 708, 1021; II, 345.

¹¹Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-71; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 95, 130, 133, 139, 178-9; Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 68.

¹²Frederick Brown's will, dated January 12, 1766, and Joshua Bishop's, August 23, 1775. Hall, *Philipse Manor Hall at Yonkers*, p. 115.

¹³Testimony of James DeLancey, Jr., John Watts, J. T. Kempe, American Loyalist Transcript, XLI, 621-22, 626-29.

¹⁴See nn. 39 and 40.

¹⁵Governor Wright's Message to the Legislature, January 6, 1846, C. Z. Lincoln, ed., *Messages from the Governors, Comprising Executive Communications to the Legislature and Other Papers . . . 1683 to 1906* (11 vols., Albany, 1909), IV, 242-243; cf. R. G. Livingston to Gary Lane, May 1, 1756, and to William Potter, Nov. 18, 1767, Gilbert Livingston Papers; Bingham and Colvin, *op. cit.*, p. 27. For example of clause in Rensselaerswyck, see above and N. Y. State, *Assembly Documents*, no. 189 (1844), VII, 20.

¹⁶Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

¹⁷Act of June 22, 1734, *Colonial Laws of New York*, II, 835-837; Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 124-5, 180-1, n. 3. On Cortlandt Manor, see Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71.

¹⁸E. B. O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland*, I, 474-75.

¹⁹Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 58-59, 62. The importance of manorial tenants is seen from the fact that in 1769 at least five sixths of the inhabitants of Westchester County lived within the bounds of the great manors there. F. J. Turner, "The Old West," *Proceedings of Wisconsin Historical Society*, 1908, p. 196.

²⁰Vide supra, n. 28. Goldsbrov Banyar and James Duane were representative speculators owning 150,800 and 52,000 acres respectively in the New Hampshire Grant Region. *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, IV, 1024-25.

²¹Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-48.

²²*Ibid.*, pp. 79-83; *Colonial Laws of N. Y.*, I, 30, 104-5, 107, 142, 148, 712; V, 202, 534, 876; S. G. Nissenon, "The Development of a Land Registration System in New York," *New York History*, XX (1939), 16-42, 161-188.

²³*Colonial Laws of N. Y.*, I, 114; cf. Fowler, *Hist. of Law of Real Property*, pp. 26, 40, 43, 44; R. B. Morris, *Studies in the His-*

tory of American Law (New York, 1930), pp. 74, 117-8.

²⁴Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 130-132.

²⁵Dated June, 1751 with a codicil July 22, 1751, Philipse-Gouverneur Land Titles, no. 18 (Col. U.).

²⁶*Laws of the State of New York, 1777-1801* (5 vols., Albany, 1886-7), I, 501-2; Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 73; *Doc. Hist. of N. Y.*, I, 377-389.

²⁷That this did not democratize land holdings will be shown below.

²⁸Within these figures large landholders will mean those owning at least 1000 acres of land, whatever their other interests may have been. Cf. Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-94.

²⁹These included Rensselaerswyck, and Livingston and Cortlandt Manors.

³⁰Mrs. Anne Grant, *Memoirs of an American Lady* (2 vols., London, 1808), pp. 147-8, 162, 199; *Doc. Rel. to Col. N. Y.*, VII, 565; Thomas Forsey v. Waddell Cunningham (J. Holt, ed., New York, 1764 in N. Y. P. L.); Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-106.

³¹W. A. Knittle, *The Early Eighteenth Century Palatine Migration . . .* (Philadelphia, 1936), chaps. 1-3.

³²For leases of 999 years to Benjamin Palmer, Joseph Crow, Jr., John Rider, Daniel Munroe, and Stephen Wilcox, all in 1764, John T. Kempe Papers, Lawsuits, P-R; "Geographical, Historical Narrative or Summary of the Present Controversy Between Daniel Nimham . . . and . . . Legal Representatives of Colonel Frederick Philipse. . . ." British Museum, Lansdowne MSS, Vol. 707, fols. 24, 26, pp. 2, 5, 6. (Hereafter cited as Geographical, Historical Narrative. . . .)

³³Testimony of Moss Kent and of James Livingston, *King v. Prendergast*, "Notes on July Assizes, 1766," Dutchess County (N. Y.), Miscellaneous MSS (N. Y. Hist. Soc.).

³⁴*N. Y. Weekly Post-Boy*, June 9, 1746. Cf. Eli Parsons' letter, Feb. 13, 1787, in *N. Y. Daily Advertiser*, March 6, 1787. Cf. "state of nature" argument in Ethan Allen and Jonas Fay, *A Concise Refutation of the Claims of New Hampshire and Massachusetts-Bay to the Territory of Vermont . . .* (Hartford, 1780), p. 11.

³⁵Testimony of Ebenezer Weed and of Samuel Towner, *King v. Prendergast*. Cf. E. J. Fisher *New Jersey as a Royal Province 1738 to 1776* (New York, 1911), esp. pp. 171-209; G. R. Minot, *The History of the Insurrections in Massachusetts in 1786* (2d ed.; Boston, 1810), esp. pp. 5-10, 15-16, 31-2, 103-6; James and John Montresor, *The Montresor Journals* (New York, 1882), p. 375; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 17, 1766.

³⁶M. B. Jones, *Vermont in the Making 1750-1777* (Cambridge, Mass., 1939). The

Onion River Company, formed in 1773, acquired 77,622 acres, sold 16,793, leaving 60,829 acres which in 1776 were valued at \$297,408.50. J. Pell, *Ethan Allen* (Boston, 1928), pp. 30, 57, 75, 285-88; J. B. Wilbur, *Ira Allen, Founder of Vermont 1751-1814* (2 vols., Boston, 1928), II, 522-25.

⁷⁵Bond, *The Quit-Rent System*, p. 457. He explains that "with the recognition of the crown ownership of the land went an acceptance, without question, of the quit-rents as the customary sign of this superior right to the soil."

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 458. Philip Davidson mentions no antifeudal aspect in his *Propaganda and the American Revolution 1763-1783* (Chapel Hill, 1941). Because of the dearth of evidence one demurs to Bond's assurance when he writes, "While not brought prominently to the front in the enumeration of grievances that preceded the final struggle, there is no doubt that the quit-rents had been a source of great irritation." Bond, *op. cit.*, p. 458.

⁷⁷*Cf. Ibid.*, p. 459.

⁷⁸C. M. Andrews, in *ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁷⁹"I have never heard this view expressed except tentatively.

⁸⁰*Laws of the State of N. Y.*, I, 173-84; Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 70, 120. Why particular landlords opposed and favored the Crown makes an intricate and significant problem in itself.

⁸¹Thus J. F. Jameson wrote that the strength of the revolutionary party lay "in the peasantry, substantial and energetic though poor, in the small farmers and frontiersmen." *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (Princeton, 1926), p. 25. *Cf.* E. E. Edwards "American Agriculture—the First 300 Years," *1940 Yearbook of Agriculture* (Washington, 1941), pp. 191-92; Nettels, *The Roots of American Civilization*, pp. 622, 624, 628. He notes the Carolina Regulator Movement as an exception.

⁸²A. C. Flick, *Loyalism in New York during the American Revolution* (New York, 1901), p. 172; *cf.* pp. 170-5, 182, 188-9, 204.

⁸³Flick, *Ibid.*, 170-5, 179, 182, 188-9, 204; Spaulding, *op. cit.*, p. 120 and n. 22.

⁸⁴All figures are drawn from a tabulation of N. Y. State, Lists of Loyalists against Whom Judgments were Given under the Confiscation Act, 1783 (N. Y. P. L.). They by no means pretend to present a complete picture of the number and character of Tories.

⁸⁵R. F. Upton, *Revolutionary New Hampshire: An Account of the Social and Political Forces Underlying the Transition from Loyal Province to American Commonwealth* (Hanover, 1936), p. 123; *New Hampshire State Papers*, VIII, 475, 476.

⁸⁶I. Hunting, *History of the Little Nine Partners* (Amenia, N. Y., 1897), pp. 40-45, 73-77; P. Force, ed., *American Archives* (9 vols., Washington, 1837-1853), I, 1164; II, 5, 176, 304-5, 834-5; III, 466, 597-606, 608, 719; VII, 377, 360, 500, 1407; VIII, 903, 977, 991; IX, 205, 231, 241-2, 289, 468, 469; *American Loyalists Transcripts*, Vols. XXXII-XXXIV and XLI-XLVI.

⁸⁷The evidence on this suggestion is insufficient. For example, the William Prendergrast mentioned is from Cambridge District, Albany County and not from the Philipse Patent. The point of the question has no application whatever to the Philipses, since they were Tories, as were many other great landlords like the Johnsons, DeLanceys, Morrisses and Robinsons. See Mark, *op. cit.*, p. 201, n. 19. Failure to consider the strong Tory sentiment amongst the tenants of the Patriot Van Rensselaers and Livingstons has led Jameson into the obvious error in the following: "On the large manorial estates the tenant farmers sided with their landlords if they took sides at all." *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, pp. 22-3.

⁸⁸H. B. Dawson, *Westchester County, New York, During the American Revolution* (New York, 1886), p. 47; *American Archives*, I, 802-3; II, 282, 314, 321, 644; IV, 1043, 1083-9; VI, 1152; VII, 1145; VIII, 384-5, 829, 991; IX, 469; O. Hufeland, *Westchester County During the Revolution 1775-1783* (White Plains, 1926), pp. 367, 92, 101. Before the Revolution, the farmers of Westchester County "were favored as few other purely agriculturists have been favored, then or since, in any part of the world." They had productive soil, fixed tenure, moderate rentals, and proximity to the New York market. Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 178-9; Spaulding, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁸⁹H. Hall, *The History of Vermont from Its Discovery to Its Admission into the Union in 1791* (Albany, 1868), pp. 190-1, 451, 454-7, 459; E. A. Bailey, "Influence toward Radicalism in Connecticut 1754-1776," *Smith College Studies in History*, V (1920), 179-252.

⁹⁰W. Slade, ed., *Vermont State Papers* (Middlebury, 1823), p. 25; *cf.* E. Allen and J. Fay, *A Concise Refutation*, p. 11; I. Allen, *Some Miscellaneous Remarks, and Short Arguments, on a Small Pamphlet* (Hartford, 1777), pp. 4-5, 13; *Connecticut Courant*, March 17, 1777.

⁹¹Pell, *Ethan Allen*, p. 77.

⁹²Wilbur, *Ira Allen*, II, 522-5; Pell, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-3.

⁹³E. P. Alexander, *A Revolutionary Conservative, James Duane of New York* (New York, 1938), 126-7, 137-47, 152-3, 168-70,

188, 201-3. Upton, *Revolutionary New Hampshire*, chap. 15.

"Negotiations between Vermont and Frederick Haldimand, Governor of Canada. . . 1779-1783," and related materials, all in *Collections of the Vermont Historical Society*, II (1871), 1-394; Pell, *op. cit.*, chaps. 25-29, 31; Wilbur, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, chaps. 6-10; S. H. Holbrook, *Ethan Allen* (New York, 1940), pp. 176-85, 193, 200-6, 272.

"Holbrook, *Ethan Allen*, pp. 117, 123-4.

"December 24, 1778, Stevens' Facsimiles of MSS in European Archives Relating to America 1773-1783 (25 vols.), no. 549.

"J. Watts in reprint from the *Morning Chronicle in The Penn. Ledger or the Weekly Advertiser*, Oct. 29, 1777 (N. Y. Hist. Soc.).

"Cf. C. and M. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization* (2 vols., New York, 1930), I, 189-211; C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Background of the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1924), esp. pp. 47, 65-6, 95-6, 112-3, 182, 187-8, 208, 212, 218-9; and his *Colonial Period of Am. Hist.*, IV, 425-28, 349 n. 4; L. M. Hacker, "The First American Revolution," *Columbia University Quarterly*, September, 1935, pp. 259-95.

"*Laws of the State of New York*, I, 173-84, 501-2; II, 191-3, 203-7, 415-6, 748-69; Fowler, *Hist. of the Laws of Real Prop. in New York*, pp. 72, 73, 79, 84; Spaulding, *N. Y. in the Critical Period*, pp. 68-70. In consideration of the uniformity and extent of the abolition of primo-geniture and entail, it is quite possible that E. E. Edwards underestimates the case somewhat when he says that "the quit-rents were abolished as an incident of the American Revolution." Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 175. Cp. Jameson, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-8, 77, 110.

"Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 81. Many of the grievances of the anti-renters of the 1840's were the same as in 1775. T. C. Cochran, *New York in the Confederation* (Philadelphia, 1932), p. 182; Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69, 70 and 80; For evaluations of the Revolution and land, see: A. Nevins, *The American States during and after the Revolution 1775-1789* (New York, 1924), p. 444; Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, chap. 2. Jameson is in error as far as New York is concerned when he says of the land system, ". . . there had been no grinding oppressions or exactions connected with it." *Ibid.*, p. 48.

"Granville Sharp to Joseph Reed, August 3, 1784, MSS of Joseph Reed, Vol. XI (N. Y. Hist. Soc.).

"H. Yoshpe, *The Disposition of Loyalist Estates in the Southern District of the State of New York* (New York, 1939); Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 203-4, nn. 30, 32.

"Spaulding, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-1; Minot, *History of the Insurrections in Massachusetts*, pp. 146-156; Mark, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-6. Space does not permit consideration of how the Revolution affected the political dominance of the landlords. E. W. Spaulding has aptly characterized the Confederation period as "the struggle of a propertied intelligent minority to maintain itself against a less well-to-do, less sophisticated majority." If propertied groups other than the landed aristocracy shared power with them, the same could not yet be said of the propertyless masses. See *N. Y. in the Critical Period*, pp. 84, 86-99; A. C. Flick, ed., *The American Revolution in New York* (Albany, 1926), pp. 83, 87, 91; D. R. Fox, *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York* (New York, 1918), p. 229.

Selected Farmer Attitudes*

By Alvin L. Bertrand†

ABSTRACT

Believing that farm program planners may well profit by a knowledge of farmer attitudes and attitude differentiation between Agricultural Planning Community Committeemen and Non-Committeemen, Grant County, Kentucky farmers were personally interviewed and pertinent attitudes noted.

In attitude and opinion, the committee members exhibited a relatively consistent pattern of differentials from the general belief of their neighbors. Compared to Non-Committee members, Committee members have a more general belief that education makes young people better farmers; are more consistent in their suggestion that rural living levels have become somewhat higher and that rural satisfaction has increased during their generation; more often believe that the production of their farm has increased since the conservation program; express a more general belief that farmers did not have prior knowledge of conservation problems; and more frequently indicate an anticipation of permanent tenure. They are in more complete agreement that land-use has changed for the better since the adoption of the federal programs; and are relatively more favorable in the evaluation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Criando que los trazadores para una programma granja se pueden sacar utilidad por mas conocimiento de actitudes de los labradores y actitudes efecto de diferenciar entre los miembros del AGRICULTURAL PLANNING COMMUNITY COMMITTEE y los que no son miembros, labradores del condado de Grant, Kentucky fueron entrevisados personalmente y sus actitudes pertinentes anotados.

En actitud y en opinion los miembros del Committee se mostraron un modelo de diferenciales relativamente consistente de la creencia general de sus vecinos. Los miembros del Committee cuando comparados con los que no son miembros se tienen una creencia mas generalmente que el educacion hace mejor los labradores jovenes; son mas consistente en sus sugescion que los nivaes de vivir han convenido poco mas alto, y que el satisfacion rural ha aumentado durante su generacion; as frecuente se creen que el produccion granja ha aumentado desde que la programma de conservar; y mas frecuente se indican un anticipacion de tenencia permanente. Ellos son en concordia mas completo que el uso del terrano ha cambiado para el mejor desde que el adopcion de la programma federal; y son relativamente mas favorables en sus oiniones del AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION.

Introduction

Rural attitudes are admittedly pertinent to national agricultural planning programs. Since previous studies¹ have shown decided differ-

* This article is adapted from chapter IV of a thesis by the author entitled "Selected Attitudes of Land-Use Planning Community Committeemen and Non-Committeemen in Grant County, Kentucky, 1940" submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kentucky in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Agriculture, June, 1941. The author acknowledges helpful suggestions and criticisms received during the course of study from Robin M. Williams, Instructor and Research Assistant in Rural Sociology, University of Kentucky.

† Instructor and Research Assistant, Department of Agricultural Economics, Louisiana State University.

¹These studies include: Zimmerman, Carle C., "Types of Farmer Attitudes," *Social Forces*, V: 591, 1927; Zimmerman, Carle C., and Black, John D., "The Marketing Attitudes of Minnesota Farmers," *University of Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station in Cooperation with U.S.D.A.*, Technical Bulletin 45, University Farm, St. Paul, 1936; and Manny, T. B., "What Ohio Farm-

entials in attitudes within given farm populations, the question may be raised as to whether or not community committee members, under the Agricultural Planning Program of the United States Department of Agriculture, have differing attitudes from non-members in the same community. This is especially important because the basic philosophy of the agricultural planning program is that the best relations between man and land is a common aim and all agricultural groups can be brought together around this objective. The program assumes that there must be general participation of the farm population in planning for agriculture. As a means of implementing these assumptions, it provides for farmers to help set up community and county agricultural planning committees in each county to study local farm problems.

Grant County, Kentucky² was selected for a study of social aspects of agricultural planning. A list of community agricultural planning committee members from each of the nine delineated communities was obtained from the office of the County Agent. Personal interviews were held with each of the community committeemen, along with an equal number of non-committeemen (selected at

random within each community from lists of farms compiled for use in the agricultural conservation program). In actual field procedure, the interviewer memorized a set of questions which had been formulated as nearly as possible in the terminology of the people studied and designed to give no suggestion as to the type of answer "expected." The questions were asked in what to the informant was an ordinary conversation and recorded after the interview.³ Altogether a total of 146 records were obtained.

In view of the extreme difficulty of studying rural people by means of the conventional attitude inventory, no attempt was made to use attitude scales or other elaborate mathematical devices. The basic method of study consist of comparisons of simple percentage distributions among qualitative categories.

Attitudes Toward Schools, Changes In Living Standards and Changes In Rural Satisfaction

Have rural people endorsed the schools wholeheartedly? Some evidence bearing on this matter is available from the responses of informants to the question, "Do you think that the schooling children get these days helps them in farming?" A majority of committee members and non-members feel that the training offered by schools is helpful to young people entering farm careers; how-

ers Think of Farmer Owned Business Organizations in that State," U.S.D.A. Circular 240, Washington, 1932; among others.

²Particular characteristics of Grant County which made it well suited for the study include: a rural population, a well-established educational and extension program, an agriculture centered around tobacco, and a program of agricultural planning work advanced to the intensified stage.

³A list of the specific questions used may be found in H. W. Beers, R. M. Williams, John S. Page, and Douglas Ensminger, "Community Land-Use Planning Committees," Kentucky AESB 417, June 1941. Pp. 235-6.

ever, committee members were in higher agreement than non-members. The respective percentages are 74 and 59. Only 10 percent of the committee group and 16 percent of the non-committee group could see little or no value of the schools to farm youth. Some doubt as to the value of the schools was expressed by 15 percent of the members and 19 percent of the non-members. One committeeman out of 73 and four non-committeemen out of 74 answered in effect "I do not know."

farming at home"; this type of attitude has been important in the reception accorded rurally supported institutions. Clearly both committee and non-committee groups acknowledge the schools to be of value to boys entering farming careers, but a greater proportion of the committee members than of the non-members express this opinion. This predominance of favorableness on the part of committeemen can undoubtedly be attributed to both a higher education⁴ and a keener awareness of educational advantages,

TABLE 1. FARMER ATTITUDES TOWARDS SCHOOLS, CHANGES IN LIVING STANDARDS, AND CHANGES IN RURAL SATISFACTION: COMPARISONS OF COMMUNITY AGRICULTURAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS, GRANT COUNTY, KENTUCKY, 1940.

Attitudes	Number		Percent	
	Member	Non-member	Member	Non-member
Value of schools to rural youth:				
Of value	54	40	74	59
Of doubtful value	11	13	15	19
Do not know	1	4	1	6
Little or no value	7	11	10	16
TOTAL	73	68	100	100
Changes in rural living levels:				
Better	55	25	78	35
No difference and uncertain	7	6	10	8
Do not know	3	2	4	3
Worse	6	39	8	54
TOTAL	71	72	100	100
Changes in rural satisfaction:				
Same or better	23	15	35	21
Uncertain	13	7	20	10
Do not know	1	1	2	1
Less	28	48	43	68
TOTAL	65	71	100	100

The distributions as presented above and shown in Table 1, are indicators of the success with which public schools have become integrated in the life of the rural population. Often farmers have testified, "My son can learn all he needs to know about

bred from a more direct contact with the complexities of society.⁵

⁴Comparisons of formal education, in the larger study, show that committeemen have the highest average education.

⁵Comparisons of social participation, in the larger study, show committeemen to have higher indices.

A brief summary is given below regarding the responses to the question: "If you compare the way farm people live—as to what they have—at the present time with what it was when you were growing up, are folks better off?". The general opinion of committeemen is that the level of living has definitely improved during their lifetime; non-committeemen are not convinced of this. A definite increase in both qualitative and quantitative consumption levels was reported by 78 percent of the committee members and 35 percent of the non-members. "No difference" or "Don't know" was the reply of 14 percent of the committeemen and 11 percent of the non-committeemen. An outstanding difference existed between the proportions of committee members and non-members (eight percent and 54 percent) whose responses indicated a decrease in material welfare and level of living.

Why should committee members, in general, hold the opinion that the level of living has improved during their lifetime while non-members, in general do not? It may be that committee members as a group, have experienced an increased ability to satisfy their wants as they grow older; that is, their earning power has kept pace with the increased wants of a higher consumption level. On the other hand, it is conceivable that the non-committee group has seen modern times create new desires, indirectly raising consumption standards, which call for more than their earning power is able to satisfy. Therefore, the non-committeemen are

at liberty to reminisce about the good old days when they were able to satisfy the few wants of pre-modern times, and pass a judgment of "lower" on the level of living.

With the advent of levels of rural consumption fostered by 20th century innovations, the nature of rural "satisfaction" with life now as compared to the present attitude concerning satisfaction with life 40 or 50 years ago is a topic worthy of investigation. Of the committeemen and non-committeemen, only 35 percent of the former and 21 percent of the latter, reported an increase in satisfaction with life among rural people. As many as 43 percent of the members and 68 percent of non-members were of the opinion that the present degree of satisfaction was less than the former degree. Replies indicating uncertainty or ignorance of any change were given by 22 percent of the committee and 11 percent of the non-committee group.

According to these data committee and non-committee groups expressed a common opinion that rural satisfaction with life has not increased with rising levels of living. It is possible that a certain amount of "memory bias" is reflected, but group differentials cannot be explained on this basis. It may be that this attitude of informants is reflective of the recent and current economic crises which have caused some social unrest. The data suggest an hypothesis similar to that implied in the current theory that present rural unrest and maladjustment derive in part from the response of agriculture

to changed national and world conditions, especially as these affect the relation between *levels* and *standards* of living.⁶

Attitudes Towards Trends in Land-Use, Knowledge of Soil Conservation and Tenure Anticipation

A majority of both committee members and non-members in the county are of the opinion that there has been

improvement" in land use. "Some improvement" was the observation of 11 percent of the committeemen and 23 percent of the non-committeemen. Only three percent and five percent of members and non-members, respectively, could see "no change" in land-use. Regression was seen by one committeeman and one non-committeeman.

TABLE 2. FARMER ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRENDS IN LAND-USE, KNOWLEDGE OF SOIL CONSERVATION PROBLEMS, AND TENURE ANTICIPATION: COMPARISONS OF COMMUNITY AGRICULTURAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS, GRANT COUNTY, KENTUCKY, 1940.

Attitudes	Number		Percent	
	Member	Non-member	Member	Non-member
Changes in land-use since 1934:				
Better: Unqualified	60	44	82	60
Better: Qualified	8	16	11	23
About the same	2	8	3	11
Do not know	2	4	3	5
Worse	1	1	1	1
TOTAL	73	73	100	100
Knowledge of Conservation Problems:				
Farmers definitely knew	9	19	16	28
Majority knew	2	3	4	4
Undecided and non-committal	1	4	2	6
Majority did not know	31	14	56	20
Definitely did not know	12	29	22	42
TOTAL	55	69	100	100
Tenure Anticipated:				
Life: always	67	45	92	62
Good sales opportunity	1	10	1	14
Leave as soon as possible	1	6	1	8
Don't know	0	2	0	3
Depends on treatment from landlord	0	4	0	6
As long as can make a living	4	2	6	3
Other	0	3	0	4
TOTAL	73	72	100	100

a material improvement in land-use during the 1934-1939 period; however, members hold this opinion proportionately more often than non-members do. Eighty-two percent of the members and 60 percent of the non-members reported "great im-

The above percentage figures reflect the farmer's realization of contributions made by the various fed-

⁶For a distinction between the concepts, "levels" and "standards" see; Taylor, Carl C., "Constructive Measures for Dealing with the South's Population Problems," *Rural Sociology*, III: 239, 1938.

eral programs to soil maintenance or improvement. Not only has the farm population become aware of a change for the better in their land, where they follow the practices outlined, but, in the very act of accepting and introducing such practices on their farms, they have broadened their education and widened their adjustment pattern. The generally more favorable opinions expressed by the committeemen have at least two implications: first, committeemen may have been selected because of their favorable reactions to land-use programs. Second, committeemen are leading farmers and have been in the vanguard of the group who experimented with and adopted the proven or acceptable land use practices.⁷

It is of considerable importance to know the degree to which assistance sponsored by the federal government has added to the farmer's knowledge of conservation problems and methods. In answer to the question, "Did farmers around here know what was wrong before these new soil conservation programs came along?", the informants answered as follows: 56 percent of all committee members and 20 percent of the non-members expressed the opinion that the majority of the farmers did not have prior knowledge of these problems. Undecided and non-committal responses that "some did, some did not" constituted two percent and six percent respectively of committee and non-com-

mittee answers. Sixteen percent of the members and 28 percent of the non-members' judgment was that all, or at least a majority, of the farmers definitely knew of such problems. In contrast were the 22 percent of committee and 42 percent of non-committee informants who were sure a majority of the farmers had not known of these problems.

In general informants thought that local farmers did not have an adequate knowledge of soil conservation problems before the recent federal programs. Some interesting speculations arise from the distribution of the committee and non-committee attitude responses. The dispersion of replies by committeemen indicates the belief that a majority of farmers were ignorant of these problems. One implication of this answer may be that committeemen believe that they had known what the problems were but that the rest of the farmers had not. This attitude may be the result of an attempt to maintain or express a superiority rating regarded as appropriate to a certain social status. There is not much doubt, however, that committeemen were aware of such problems in more instances than non-committeemen. The proportion of the non-committeemen reporting that farmers knew about soil conservation problems, hints at a resentment toward the "bureaucracy" of federal programs. On the other hand, the proportion who reported that a majority of the farmers had not known of such problems may be construed as manifesting an appreciation for the federal programs of soil conservation.

⁷Tabulations which are part of the larger study show that committee members are above the average in size of farm operated, success in accumulating land, social participation, etc.

Probably these differing non-committee answers are the result of several possible adjustments to a conflicting situation. Answers of the former nature may be an attempt to rationalize an existing ignorance and answers of the latter nature likely indicate an acceptance of the program and a recognition of its educational value as related to soil conservation problems.

Is our rural society becoming stable through a sense of security of tenure? As interest in land-use and other government programs is likely to be fundamentally different in a short-run or long-run farm tenure anticipation this question expresses an attitude pertinent to agricultural planning. Most farmers anticipate permanent tenure on their present farms; the non-committeemen hold this anticipation to a lesser degree than committee members. Ninety-two percent of the committee group and 62 percent of the non-member group expressed unconditional lifetime tenure anticipation. The non-committeemen were more willing to sell their farms at the presentation of a good sales opportunity than the members; respectively, fourteen percent and one percent answered to this effect. About six percent of the committeemen and three percent of the non-committeemen were willing to stay as long as they could make a living. Only a very small proportion of both member and non-member groups actually wanted to leave as soon as possible (respectively, one and eight percent). One-twentieth of the non-

members replied that their tenure anticipation hinged directly on treatment received from their respective landlords. Three non-committeemen, four percent of that group, answered with "I don't know" when this question was put to them.

The free land available before the exhaustion of the public domain fostered instability of tenure. With ever present opportunities for acquiring new land, farmers were prone to place less value and more abuse on their holding of the moment. However, these days have gone and emphasis is being placed on long tenure periods. An indication of this emphasis is found in the plurality of committee members and non-members anticipating permanent tenure on their present farms.

Attitudes Towards the Influence of Federal Programs on Land Use, the Control Features of the AAA Program and the Continuation of Crop Control

Additional information indicative of farmer opinions toward government programs confirms the previous replies of informants. The general opinion of farmers interviewed is that the farm programs of the federal government have had a favorable influence upon land-use; committee members, however, are more positive of this. To the question, "What effect have the government programs had on the way farmers use their land?", 85 percent of the committee members and 59 percent of the non-committee members replied that the program had effected "great improvement." "Some improvement" was mentioned

by 11 percent of the members and 21 percent of the non-members. Of the committee group three percent reported no change and slightly over one percent expressed an unfavorable opinion. Of the non-committee group four percent saw no change, six percent had no opinion and ten percent replied that the only result was a regression in land-use.

These data supplement previously discussed attitudes showing that farmers attribute certain benefits to the various agricultural programs. According to this analysis, the primary task of convincing farmers of advantages in certain land-use practices recommended by governmental agencies has been largely accomplished. It may be that through a

gradual process, farmers are moving toward long-time endorsement of these practices and the integration of them into rural mores. The higher proportion of committee members giving favorable opinions reflects differential rates of change among rural groups which differ in formal education, social participation, property ownership, and leadership behavior.

The AAA program is undoubtedly vital to farmers in Grant County because of dependence upon tobacco for a large part of their cash income. Sentiments as expressed in answer to the question, "What do you think of these government programs to control crops?", reflect the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness with which they accept these pro-

TABLE 3. FARMER ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE INFLUENCE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON LAND-USE, THE CONTROL FEATURES OF THE AAA PROGRAM, AND THE CONTINUATION OF CROP CONTROL: COMPARISONS OF COMMUNITY AGRICULTURAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS, GRANT COUNTY, KENTUCKY, 1940.

Attitudes	Number		Percent	
	Member	Non-member	Member	Non-member
Effect of federal programs on land-use:				
Great improvement	62	42	85	59
Some improvement	8	15	11	21
No change	2	3	3	4
Do not know	0	4	0	6
Regression	1	7	1	10
TOTAL	73	71	100	100
Control features of AAA:				
Favorable	25	22	50	31
Favorable with qualifications	16	20	32	28
Non-committal, do not know	1	2	2	3
Unfavorable with qualifications	5	10	10	14
Unfavorable	3	17	6	24
TOTAL	50	71	100	100
Continuance of crop control:				
Favorable	33	29	66	41
Favorable with qualifications	6	11	12	15
Non-committal, do not know	2	8	4	11
Unfavorable with qualifications	6	4	12	6
Unfavorable	3	19	6	27
TOTAL	50	71	100	100

grams. Committeemen are more favorable than non-committeemen in their opinion of the AAA program. Exactly 50 percent of the committeemen were definitely favorable in their responses; the comparable non-committee figure is 31 percent. Qualified replies of "Favorable" were given by 32 percent of the committee and 28 percent of the non-committee informants. Only two percent of the members and three percent of the non-members were non-committal or unable to give an opinion. At the other extreme were the six percent of the committee and 24 percent of the non-committee groups who expressed definitely unfavorable opinions. An additional 10 per cent and 14 percent respectively were, as evidenced by qualifying phrases, somewhat unfavorable.

In view of the widespread assumption that some form of farm production control is likely to be a permanent part of agricultural society, farmer attitudes toward a program so vital to them are especially important. Grant County farmers are generally favorable to the program; committee members more so than non-members. The high percentages of qualified statements indicate approval of the crop control theory but disapproval of either the program set-up or the administration. Several informants, however, are decidedly unfavorable toward these programs. In the light of the above data it would seem that the AAA programs in the area studied have to make considerable headway before gaining universal approval from the farm popu-

lation. Possibly time will be an important factor in bringing about universal acceptance.

To determine to what extent the farmers desired the continuance of control programs, interviewees were asked, "Do you think the government should keep on with these programs to control crops?". In general, farmers favor the continuance of some form of crop control; committeemen were more favorable in this attitude than non-committeemen. Slightly over three-fourths of the committee and nearly three-fifths of the non-committee persons interviewed expressed themselves as favoring a continuation of farm programs similar to those of the AAA. Among members, 66 percent were classified as definitely favorable and 12 percent as unfavorable with qualifications. Among non-committeemen, 41 percent expressed unequivocally favorable opinions and 15 percent were favorable with some reservations. Definitely unfavorable replies were given by six percent of the committee group and 27 percent of the non-committee group. Twelve percent of the members and six percent of the non-members were classified in the "Favorable with qualifications" group. Four percent and 11 percent of committee and non-committee populations were either non-committal or gave an answer of "Do not know."

These statistics, and the specific attitudes expressed, indicate that farmers have accepted the "theory" of crop control, that is, they believe that improved conditions can be achieved by curtailing crops and

thereby raising prices. The major issue is not the need but the organization and administration of the program. Committee members favor the continuance of some type of crop control program to a greater extent than do the non-members. No doubt this differential is due to both a greater understanding of the underlying

philosophy, and to differences in economic interests, social status, independence, and in-group mores. The committee members, because of these differentials, are more apt to view the situation from a longtime standpoint, as contrasted to the "immediate-burden view" of the average farmer.

Culture Change In Southern Illinois*

By Herbert Passin†

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the process of culture change in Stringtown from a "neighborhood" to a "town-country" stage, with particular reference to the relations between economic changes and other cultural changes in the community. Old Stringtown was a small, relatively self-contained community with a basic agricultural economy, and was characterized by high community spirit, church leadership in community affairs, and by strong family cohesiveness. New Stringtown, because of the introduction of mechanical devices in agriculture, greater dependence on the outside market, and the post-war depression in agriculture, has experienced vast cultural changes in family structure, religion, and in the values and attitudes of its inhabitants. One of the most significant disrupting forces in the culture of Old Stringtown has been the Moonshining Era of the '20's, during which whiskey-making and bootlegging became the chief occupation of the Stringtowners. Economically profitable, bootlegging led to the disruption of the cohesive forces of the old culture through conflict with the church and legal authority. This led to the decline of the church as community leader. Resultant increased horizontal mobility introduced with the automobile, the increase in purchasing power through bootlegging prosperity, and outside opportunities for youth have helped complete the social disorganization. Stringtown in 1939 was a small, poor, crossroads village, partially dependent on WPA, marked by fragmentation of its old culture, by secularization and individuation of its values and attitudes. Yet in the midst of this change, largely due to economic factors, can be seen survivals of the old culture as evidenced by the more conservative and wealthier inhabitants.

Este artículo trata del proceso de cambio cultural en Stringtown, desde la condición de "vecindad" (neighborhood) a la de dependencia, con particular referencia a las relaciones entre los cambios económicos y otros cambios culturales en la comunidad. Stringtown Vieja era una pequeña comunidad de relativa independencia económica, con una economía agrícola básica. Se

* This study was conducted in 1939 at the behest of the Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, to whom I herein make grateful acknowledgement. There have been some slight changes since that time, but these will be reported in the course of

publication of results obtained during a field trip in 1941. The present report is abridged from the original mimeographed by the Social Science Research Council.

† Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

caracterizaba por una solidaridad comunal, y por una fuerte cohesión familiar. Stringtown Nueva, por causa de la introducción de las invenciones mecánicas en la agricultura, por su mayor dependencia del mercado exterior, y por la depresión agrícola de la post-guerra, ha sufrido enormes cambios culturales en la estructura de la familia, en la religión, y en los valores y las actitudes de sus habitantes. Una de las fuerzas de desrupción más significativas de la cultura de Stringtown Vieja ha sido el período de licor ilegal después de 1920, durante el cual la venta y la fabricación ilegales de licores llegaron a ser las principales ocupaciones de los aldeanos de Stringtown. Por ser lucrativo, el contrabando de licores causó la destrucción de las fuerzas de cohesión de la cultura vieja por medio de los conflictos con la iglesia y con las autoridades legales. Como resultado de ésto, tuvo lugar el descaecimiento de la iglesia como centro de la comunidad. La mayor movilidad horizontal que resultaba de la introducción del automovil, el aumento del poder adquisitivo por medio de la prosperidad a base del contrabando, y las oportunidades del mundo afuera para la juventud, han contribuido a la desorganización social de la comunidad. Stringtown en el año de 1939 era una encrucijada pequeña y pobre, que dependía parcialmente de la WPA, caracterizada por la fragmentación de su vieja cultura y por la secularización e individuación de sus valores y actitudes. Sin embargo, en medio de este cambio, debido en mayor parte a los factores económicos, pueden observarse algunos vestigios de la antigua cultura que son evidentes entre los habitantes más acaudalados y conservativos.

The General Problem

The problem of chief interest for the anthropologist in this area is that of acculturation, specifically that type of acculturation which is known as urbanization. J. H. Kolb¹ has offered a suggestive developmental schema which is probably extensively applicable to American rural history. Only two of the stages concern us here. The first is the "neighborhood stage," in which

all members of all families in a small locality were bound together by more general or common interests into primary groups.

In the second, the "town-country" or "urban-community" stage,

household and neighborhood self-sufficiency gave way to a greater interdependence of town and country.

These may be roughly fitted to what seem to be discrete moments of integration in the history of Stringtown: the first corresponds to Old

Stringtown, the second corresponds to the present period in Stringtown.

However, our concern is not merely with the descriptive differences between separate time-intervals in the history of Stringtown, but rather with the process of culture change itself. Our task is to understand how precisely this change has taken place, what are the factors involved, how are all phases of the life of the people affected.

Two bench marks present themselves as most significant for the purposes of drawing the most effective contrast. The first is Old Stringtown, as it was, substantially unchanged except for small accretions in the realm of material culture, until the post-war period. It was a community of independent farmers, self-sufficient within its ecological boundaries for the greater part of its needed goods and services, relatively isolated from major socio-economic tendencies in

¹J. H. Kolb, "Family Life and Rural Organization," *Publ. Am. Sociol. Soc.*, V, XXIII, 1929, pp. 146-147.

American life, with an active vigorous participation in the communal-cultural life. The second bench mark is taken as Stringtown 1939, that Stringtown which was directly accessible to and observed by the field worker. The scene here is in sharp contrast; instead of independent farmers, there are sharecroppers, WPA'ers, reliefers, factory workers; there is dependence upon the outside world for most of its daily needs; there is a high degree of disorganization. It is safe to say that if not for WPA, the community would not hold together at all. Strong centrifugal tendencies, especially in the economic sphere, with very few centripetal checks, would soon tear the community apart and send 75% migrating elsewhere to obtain a livelihood.

It is a basic objective of the inquiry to determine the exact character of the relation between the economic changes and the other cultural changes in the community, as, *e.g.*, religious, social, associational, familial, inter-sexual.

There is considerable evidence that the two selected points in the time series were mediated both temporally and sociologically by a period in which the overwhelming majority of the population went onto a whiskey-making economy. This period extended from about 4 years after the World War to about 1937. During this period at least 50% of the employable male population served prison terms in both county and Federal prisons varying in length from 3 months to 2½ years and paid heavy

finer for violation of the Prohibition Act.

Whiskey days became almost the Golden Age of Stringtown, a time of money aplenty, automobiles, women, amusements, increased physical and social locomotion. One is constantly aware of the all-pervasiveness of the moonshining period in the present thinking of the people. The experience is still fresh and vivid. The extent of the effect of moonshining—which was finally crushed by the combined impact of Federal revenue agents and the fall in the price of whiskey—on the economic situation, on changes in attitudes, religious behavior, desires, and general customs has been explored. Tentatively we may state that the key to much of the change is to be found in a thorough analysis of the moonshining phase.

Viewed from a more general standpoint, what we are observing is an instance of the process, familiar in American history, whereby a small, relatively self-contained social unit becomes transformed to meet the demands of an advanced industrial economy orientated to the world market. Externally it is signalized by the tractor, the automobile, the change from animal and human-powered haybaling to the use of a new mechanical haybaler, which was first introduced in Stringtown in the late summer of 1939.

Internally there is a vast difference in the life of Old Stringtown and Stringtown 1939. Children are reared differently, there are different religious beliefs, there are different

techniques of maintenance, different skills, different pleasures and pains, different sanctions. The change has not been in making a living alone; the alternate modes of subsistence appear on the scene as full-clothed systems of thought, value and attitude. What we are concerned with is a change in living itself, or in the language of anthropology, a change in culture.

Old Stringtown

Our knowledge of Old Stringtown must come from historical reconstruction based upon the memory of living people, historical records, and one published history. Certain tentative statements may be made on the basis of such data, but there are wide gaps and variations in adequacy among the several observations recorded.

It seems basically to have been an agricultural economy with a high degree of self-sufficiency.

The land has always been the chief source of livelihood for Stringtown. Their forefathers poured in from Virginia and Tennessee to take possession of government lands after the War of 1812. The constant pressure for land drove them after George Rogers Clarke and other great explorers to homesteading lands, lands granted to soldiers and others who were willing to work them. The early settlers were granted small holdings of from 40-100 acres, which they cleared, and then sowed with wheat, oats and corn.

From about 1840 onwards the timber came to be exploited for other

than purely local purposes. The timber was exploited both by farmers and regular lumbermen, acting as a satisfactory filler in the farming off-season. In case of necessity, it was always possible to make a living from shingling.

The woods abounded with game of all kind, including bear, deer, and raccoon. Men hunted and trapped for fresh meat and fur, and many were able to derive a living from that too.

Fundamentally the men were farmers who hunted, fished, trapped, and logged. There seems to have been extensive participation in all the available techniques of maintenance. In the earliest period there were practically no secular professionals, except the village blacksmith, who was an extremely important person. Later there was a doctor, a few storekeepers, an occasional lawyer; but the bulk of these services, when required, were sought in the neighboring towns. Sacred professionals—ministers—were part of the tradition of American culture, and consequently they were found wherever there was a large enough group to support them. Childbirth required the occasional services of a midwife.

This fundamental condition of land-ownership obtained substantially unchanged until the post-war period. The deep waves of change which steadily drove the American farmer off the land did not reach Stringtown until long after the process was on its way in other parts of the country. This process followed directly upon the closer integration of Stringtown with the wider American and world

economy, with their monetary reckoning and dependence upon seemingly capricious extra-local market factors.

In the earlier period "almost everything was barter, hardly any money was used at all." Now, of course, all major transactions are carried on in terms of money.

There was a high degree of communal cooperation in farm activities. To quote a 50-year old resident:

It was a community spirit. It was you help me and I'll help you.

And in the fall of the year when they went to slaughter their hogs for meat for the winter, a bunch—6 or 8 of his neighbors—would gather together. They'd take teams and wagons and go out into the woods and kill hogs and clean them up and quarter them up and divide them up.

And, if a man refused to reciprocate in this exchange,

they just considered him no good, kind of an outcast. They wouldn't have anything to do with him. And before long he'd have to leave the community. Of course, they didn't force him to leave, but he'd want to because of the way they was treating him.

The community was almost entirely self-sufficient. They raised all their own food, except spices. They raised their own cotton, which the women spun into cloth for the clothes they made. Every Christmas the father of the family made a pair of shoes for each of the children. They built their own houses and furniture. They raised their own tobacco for the men and women to chew and snuff

up. The village blacksmith was the mechanical expert who fixed watches and guns. He was the jeweler, gunsmith, coppersmith, mechanic. The dead were buried in home-made coffins by the families and friends, who also dug the grave. The minister was a member of the community.

Churches once comprised the very nub of the social life of Stringtown and the surrounding countryside. Two flourishing churches, the Cumberland Presbyterian and the Christian, conducted daily services, performed marriages, baptised children, conducted funerals, converted souls, held ice cream socials, missionary and Christian Endeavor meetings. Each church supported a permanent pastor who resided in the community, the children were without exception sent to Sunday School, and the people attended regularly.

It was important not only with respect to the religious allegiances commanded, but also in connection with social activities, social control, and communal solidarity. The tightly-knit strands which seemed to tie the community together as an emotional, as well as spiritual unit, centered in the church activities.

Thus the role of the church as the organizer and leader of social and associational activities was particularly important. Ice cream socials, occasional dances, picnics, dinners of all kinds, provided occasion for conviviality among both young and old. Since they were restricted in physical mobility through poor roads and bad transportation facilities, they sought a great portion of their social activ-

ities in church and intra-community affairs. The exact part played by the automobile, with its enormously expanded freedom of movement, in the breakdown of church influence merits meticulous analysis and comparison with similar processes elsewhere.²

According to reports, there was a good deal of intra-community social activity even outside the church. Family gatherings, communal affairs in connection with houseraising, harvesting, and other activities requiring such labor, were frequent.

The family cohesiveness seems to have been part of the general fabric of intracommunal activity which marked the flourishing, relatively self-contained period in Stringtown. Its roots were economic as well as ethical. Later we shall note that with certain economic changes came associated changes in the structure of the family. The kinship structure involved, first of all, attitudes and sentiments of duties, obligations, friendship, reciprocal interchange of gifts and help among a group of kin, constituted of a relatively wide range of relationship as compared with usual urban standards. The limits were not definite, but they certainly included the 2nd cousin, and probably most of those designated by the same family name, although in intensity grading away directly with the distance of blood relationship. One might even speak of a rudimentary, amorphous "clan,"³ whose unity was occasionally

dramatically expressed at such communal gatherings as picnics and political rallies when

The Jones and Smiths would always be a-scraping. You'd pick out the best Jones and the best Smith fighters and they'd fight it out at picnics or socials.

The old family seems to have been strongly patriarchal. There was a fairly sharp division of function between husband and wife. Making a living in field and forests was the chief task of the men; housekeeping, the small gardening, childrearing were the chief tasks of the women. Boys followed their fathers' work, girls their mothers'. As soon as they were physically able, the young boys worked out on the farms, driving the team, behind the plow, pitching hay. Many fathers at this time gave livestock to their sons with the expectation that these would multiply and provide the basis for a future livelihood. Occasionally too, a small piece of land was set aside for their own cultivation and profit.

With respect to the family outside the immediate household, there were a number of important types of relationship. First, there was a general feeling of kin obligation. Practically this had a direct economic corollary in cooperative labor of all kinds. One's first call was upon one's relatives. The brother and his sons would always be expected to assist when the immediate household was inadequate for a given task, such as sowing, plowing, harvesting, house-building, etc. And in return there was a strong sentiment of reciprocal obligation. In

²Cf. R. S. and H. Lynd, *Middletown*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.

³Not in the strict technical anthropological sense.

the more traditionally-minded and well-to-do conservative families today there are still traces of such co-operation.

Second, intra-familial social activities played an important part both as an expression and affirmation of the kinship bond. A great deal of informal visiting occurred, and on all holiday occasions there would be a big family gathering, usually at the old family homestead where the elders lived. On Sundays family dinners were held, the households exchanging the role of host from week to week.

Thirdly, the whole family tended to present a united front to outsiders, members taking each other's part in fights, arguments, etc. They tended to go to the same churches, vote the same political tickets; help was extended—both financial and physical—to members who were in temporary need.

It was in and through the family that the children and youth were prepared for their future places in the community. The girls followed fairly regularly their mothers' footsteps. They learned the basic activities of womenfolk—housekeeping—and developed skills in cooking, sewing, gardening, child care. When they married, they simply transferred these skills to the husband's household.

The boys learned to farm, read the signs of nature, raise and tend livestock, hunt and trap. From their earliest days the boys worked side by side with their fathers and from them absorbed the basic equipment for life. Schooling—through the primary grades—was considered desirable by

some, but not altogether necessary because it in no way improved farming skill nor did it have any other economic value for the typical boy. High school was an unaccustomed luxury, and college was only for those who definitely planned to pursue careers outside of the community.

In Old Stringtown, social control was vested in intra-community hands. Most criminal actions were met with swift and immediate community action. No formal officers existed—indeed the community has never had any corporate officialdom; it has always been an unincorporated village. A thief, *e.g.*, would be visited by a large group of men who would "whup" him and warn him against future stealing. One warning was generally sufficient. In one lone reported case of incest, community isolation compelled the family to leave, although no official action was taken. There were no fences between farms, and disputes were generally amicably settled.

The church seemed to be a central factor in social control too. Behavior was evaluated in terms of the standards which the church represented, and sharp deviations were disapproved. But the sanctions seem largely to have been diffuse rather than organized. County authorities from *M* intervened in extreme cases of violation of the criminal and civil law, but we gather the impression that these were extraneous and viewed by the community rather as a visitation from the "outside."

There remains one more feature of Old Stringtown without which the

picture would be incomplete. We tend to think of magical beliefs and practices as characteristic only of preliterate communities, but I venture to suggest that the anthropologist interested in the matter can probably collect a large and compelling *dossier* on magic in American rural communities. In some cases it is not merely an embroidery on the fabric of daily life, but an important—one is almost tempted to say fundamental—part of the business of making a living. From my materials only tantalizing fragments can be offered, which suggest however that in the past these magical ideas were of greater currency than at present.⁴

If these were data from a preliterate community, we might discuss these persistent folk beliefs under the headings of agricultural magic, weather counsels, menstrual taboos, and medical beliefs. The Ladies' Birthday Almanac is frequently consulted for relevant information. Certain crops should be planted in the dark of the moon; others in light moon. If these injunctions are not obeyed, the wheat and corn, *e.g.*, will be poor in quality, the potatoes will go to vine.

In butchering time it's the same way. If you butcher in the dark of the moon the meat won't fry away. But if you butcher in the light of the moon it'll fry away and mostly go to grease.

A number of other activities are

determined by the position of the signs of the Zodiac.

Stringtown 1939

In the summer of 1939 Stringtown remains a small crossroads village of 313 persons dispersed in some 90-100 families. The great majority are descendents of former residents of the immediate ecological area. On the whole, however, present land holdings are smaller than in the past, and no more than 1/3rd own their own land.

Most of the houses have been built since 1900, but there are several which date back to 1875 and possibly earlier. They all lack any of the modern urban conveniences. Water is drawn from wells and cisterns which have been dug almost 100 years ago. Except for a few patterned on local WPA specifications, the outhouses are old and in poor repair. There is no electricity from a high wire. One sees mostly kerosene lamps, ranging from old relics to relatively modern Sears-Roebuck varieties. Some 8 households had Delco units which supply juice for light, radio, etc. There were 26 radios, of which at least 5 were out of order, and there were 5 telephones. The cookstoves are old substantial wood-burners, chiefly relics from Stringtown's past.

A population analysis reveals a fairly typical, although exaggerated rural distribution, with a bimodal curve. The break occurs in the range of adults of employable age, while there is a heavy weighting in the upper end of the scale. The peculiar shape may be explained by the emigration of many young men and

⁴*Cf.* forthcoming report by Herbert Pas-sin and John W. Bennett, "Changes in agricultural magic in Southern Illinois."

women who were unable to see a future livelihood in the immediate area. Some have gone into the nearby towns where they work in the glove and button factories. Many of the girls have married outside of Stringtown and have gone to live with their husbands.

As has been noted earlier, the great bulk of the available bottom country is owned by a small group of landowners, resident and absentee, who rent it out on a sharecropping system. About one-third of the Stringtown residents own their own land. Another third work as sharecroppers. These latter usually are compelled to add to their incomes by hiring out for part-time work, picking peaches, working for other farmers, sending their wives to work. The remainder depend upon WPA and relief. The ranks of sharecroppers and WPA'ers interpenetrate frequently. An important element is the number of women who engage in gainful employment on WPA and the nearby factories. About 8 of the young men work on Government river channel boats. Most of the young men have no greater wish than to work on these boats where they get a regular and adequate wage with prospects of advancement. They have become the envy of the local youth. Farming has catapulted to the bottom of the list of desirable occupations for Stringtown youth. Working on a Government boat ranks first; working in a factory next; and farming comes last. Only the sons of farm-owners look upon the land as a future source of livelihood. The others turn out-

ward, indeed have come to hate farming.

Intra-family and intra-community cooperation in economic activities is a very infrequent occurrence. It may be observed occasionally among the independent landowners, but it is much more common to hire men when necessary at low daily wages of from \$.75 to \$1.75. In this work both unemployed and sharecroppers participate. Some of the farmers employ Negro help because they can pay them less and extract more work from them. In general, hiring of extra men is a distinctly utilitarian business involving pay and not reciprocal exchange of work.

As might be expected, the church occupies only a minor place in Stringtown life today. The two churches have small memberships, no regular pastors, poorly attended meetings and Sunday School sessions, and practically no social activity of any kind.

Every 3rd or 4th Sunday the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has a visiting preacher from Tennessee. On other Sundays they hold Sunday School for adults as well as for children. The Christian Church is unable to maintain even an occasional pastor, and so they hold only Sunday School services. As often as finances warrant, generally once or twice a year, a revival meeting is held with visiting evangelists. These are held during a lull in farming activities to enable to fullest attendance on the part of the farmers. At these meetings which may last every night for two weeks, the attendance is almost double the regular attendance.

The churches are not very friendly toward each other. The Christians feel that the Presbyterians are "clannish" and "cold"; the Presbyterians feel that the Christians are "lower" than they.

The composition of the two churches has an interesting bearing on this situation. Both churches are attended almost exclusively by the farming families; the WPA and factory workers hardly ever attend. There is a general feeling that the "better" people in the community are churchgoers; although this does not seem to act as a stimulus for sending children to Sunday School. But the Cumberland Presbyterian Church definitely has the more well-to-do and conservative farmers—this accounts for its hill preponderance—and the Christians have fewer independent farmers and more sharecroppers.

Among the younger people, religious belief, as conventionally interpreted, seems to be absent. Most of the older persons verbally profess some belief in most of the teachings and ideas of the Old Testament, although they are disinterested in a practical profession of their faith. It was even reported that several men had ordered that they not be buried in the church because they were somehow "hard on the church." Very little of the usual repertoire of religious sacraments and consecrations take place in the church. Most marriages are performed by justices of the peace in the neighboring area and are unmarked by any special communal notice except when an occasional chivaree is held. Only in con-

nection with funerals do people approach the church as they once did; only here does it occupy a central place in the sentiments and ideas of the majority of the people.

Social activity is today a highly secular affair, with only a small handful of the faithful gracing the infrequent picnics, ice cream socials, and other money-raising affairs of the church. For the majority, amusement and recreation mean the commercialized types which are to be found in motion pictures, taverns, roadhouses, skating-rinks, and public parks. The automobile, by increasing the range of mobility, has enabled people to go far beyond the confines of church and local community for their amusements. In the summer of 1939 some 2 or 3 of the old-fashioned type of pound-dinners were held for young people, but these were neither well attended nor well publicized. Dances at the roadside taverns were much more popular.

Among the younger people there is inter-community visiting with the neighboring localities. *B* and *M* provide many common meeting places. Saturday nights there is a large migration to the stores and amusement centers of *M*. On Sundays, many of both men and women who do not attend church go to the ball games nearby. The automobile has become a prime value among Stringtown youth. Despite the poverty of a majority of the people, almost all have cars, and a large proportion have relatively new cars. The greatest desire of most of the boys is to own a new car. Whenever one appears in the com-

munity it is closely examined and discussed for weeks.

For girls a car is perhaps the most desirable feature about a young man.

Girls wouldn't go nowhere without a fellow has a car.

Driving around and getting away from the community has infected many girls with the desire to leave and go to work elsewhere. Says an informant:

I've noticed some of these girls after they go out a lot, they want to get out and go to M—— for a job.

The only formal or informal associations to be found are the small, ineffectual and half-hearted Christian Endeavors associated with the two churches. These meet approximately once a month, number only a few youths apiece, and conduct activities which simply reduplicate the Sunday School services in the churches. The 4-H Club died of apathy in Stringtown and retreated to the hill country where its failure to hold dances is less of an insuperable handicap than it is in Stringtown.

By charting kinship relations from one individual as the starting point, it was found that everybody in Stringtown is related to everybody else. Despite this interesting fact, which is a testimonial to the long residence in the area of most of the families, family obligation is not a very important unifying feature in the community. The economic basis of the unity of the extended family no longer exists, and except in con-

servative circles, the households are relatively isolated and constitute an economic, cooperative, affectional unity in themselves. Within this group there is cooperation and sharing of resources, but it is loose and always close to collapsing on economic grounds. It is quite difficult to maintain the central position of the family when the mother goes out to work, members leave home to find work wherever it is to be found, settle elsewhere after marriage.

The traditional patriarchal autocracy is considerably tarnished by the fact that in many instances the women contribute equally, if not more, than men to the maintenance of the household. As in many other parts of the country, we are witnessing a transition from the old type of family authority which resided in the father-mother, to a new matriarchal or equalitarian-head family. Many of the girls, for their part, instead of remaining in the home and helping their mothers in the household duties until marriage, go out to work in factories and homes in the area, thus extending their social and intellectual horizons, firing them with greater ambitions than can be satisfied within the community, and giving them an expanded sense of worth within the family situation.

Except among the "better" families, where the old patterns are largely still in force, this is the case in the community. A matter of both overt behavior and explicit statement, it is apparent that the family bonds have lost their former potency. Even intra-familial visiting is infrequent

except among the conservative families.

Children are not directly trained for any future life pursuits, largely because both parents and community have little to offer. Children have few well-defined duties and chores. They cannot follow in their parents' footsteps. As a consequence they are poorly controlled and spend most of their time engaged in idle pursuits and pastimes. It is only in the exceptional families that children are thoroughly occupied with household duties. The children are quite generally considered to be "mean" and uncontrollable.

Because of the contraction of economic possibilities within the community today, one discovers an increasing concern with the problem of educating the children. The feeling is increasing that a high school education is desirable and necessary so the youth will be somewhat equipped to make a living outside the community.

In a community of this sort, where for a long period of years consistent violation of laws imposed by a rather vague "outside" Federal authority constituted the chief mode of subsistence, one can distinguish two types of social control. The first regulates relations between persons in the community of such character as can be settled outside the formal law—fights, proper moral behavior, respect for property, etc. The second is concerned with the interdictions imposed by state, county, and Federal governments, generally comprehended in the person of the sheriff and revenue officers.

With respect to the first, there is an increasing disposition to resort to outside authority for settlement of the issues, although there is by no means consensus on the subject. This growing willingness to permit outside interference is attributable to the inability of family, church, and community controls to keep people in line.⁵

With respect to the second type of law, the issue is less simple, because there are deep social memory-residues of moonshining days when people were "persecuted" in the pursuit of their livelihood. A large percentage of the male population has served fairly severe prison terms in Federal and state penitentiaries. And this fact has tended to affect the general attitude toward all phases of the "law." It is in this connection that Stringtown acquired the name and reputation of "Pistol City" in the countryside and among revenue officers.

Viewed from an historical perspective, it seems likely that the economic decline of the community plus the associated urbanizing tendencies are the chief factors in the loosening of local social controls. The family is no longer the strong force in interpersonal relations that it once was. The community as a whole is not a well-integrated unit commanding the loyalists of the villagers. And the central place formerly occupied by the church has not been replaced by a comparable force.

⁵As in the case of moral delinquency among the girls.

The Moonshining Era

Here we plunge into the very substance of our problem. The moonshining phase of Stringtown history lies between Old Stringtown and Stringtown 1939. It mediates between the two not only in the sheer historico-temporal sense, but in the sense that it profoundly affected the course and nature of the culture changes which occurred.

Whiskey seems to have been introduced within the first 4 years following the first World War. It seems to have been a direct consequence of economic pressure. American agriculture as a whole was deeply affected by the sharp decline in world market prices, the well known post-war agricultural depression which has continued almost unabated until the very present.⁶ With these came a concomitant increase in taxation of land values. The combined effect of these two factors nationally has been the progressive driving of the small farmer off the land, a phenomenon familiar enough, in fact and fiction, in the South. Attendant upon this process has been sharecropping, tenant-farming, mass and mechanized agriculture, and large-scale migration from country to city.

It was in this situation that whiskey-making presented itself as the practical alternative to unemployment and bankruptcy. Kentucky moonshiners were already using the densely foliated bottom country for hideouts for their "rigs." In the natural course of events, Stringtown

men made contact with them and began to try their hand at the game.

Whiskey-making first began among a small number of men, but gradually, despite resistance from the church and law-enforcement agencies, it spread until some 75% of the employable males were involved in the business. It has been estimated that between 80-90% of the families were eventually involved either directly in the manufacture of liquor or indirectly in the supplying of such necessities as corn and sugar to the moonshiners. The community effected a complete shift to a moonshining economy.

While the returns were high, the risks and dangers were commensurately great. This gave the whole period a dangerous and reckless character.

The conflict with the church was the first serious clash between the old order and the new. The earliest moonshiners met the determined resistance of the church and townspeople. At this time the churches were well-attended, flourishing, and influential. Moonshining introduced a sharp rift in the community. The immediate and violent disapproval of the church went to the extreme lengths of actually assisting enforcement officers in the apprehension and capture of moonshiners. The result was that these moonshiners withdrew their wives and children from church activities, and on many occasion ended all friendly relations with church members. Many families were rent apart on the issue.

⁶1939.

When finally, however, the majority of the community was dependent upon whiskey, the church withdrew its hostility.

When whiskey was going full bloom the churches didn't say so much about it, because you know usually a relative was in it, so they jest kept a shet-mouth hands-off policy.

But by that time it had lost the majority of its membership and continued in support only among those who had resisted moonshining.

The moonshiners never did return to the churches, nor did their families, in the main, even to this day. Thus the church was dealt a vital blow. Pastors had to be dropped, and major activities ceased for lack of support.

A major factor in the case of the youth was the automobile, which so increased their mobility and contacts that they no longer had to confine themselves to the nearby churches, nor indeed to the community, for social contacts. They made contacts outside of the community, and there began to find all their social and recreational activities.

In early whiskey days, family life proceeded much as described for Old Stringtown. It is clear from all the evidence that serious changes began at this time, culminating in the present state of affairs. The changes concern both family cohesiveness and family structure.

Many of the families experienced prolonged and severe disagreements among the members on the advisability and morality of the new enter-

prise. Often disagreement resulted in the disruption of all friendly contacts, and the solidarity of the large family was profoundly shaken. It is probable that the economic factor of lack of need for large-scale cooperation further weakened the large family. The household was a more efficient cooperative unit for economic endeavor than the large family in the new situation.

With rapidly expanded outside contact, many of the women attained a good deal of independence and mobility. New ideas and values on the place of women were acquired, and many wives of moonshiners are still regarded as "extravagant," ostentatious, and unwifely for their "gallivanting" around during whiskey days. During the periods when the men were away in prison, the wives functioned as active heads of the family. Those who had no reserve saved against these sudden visitations of the law had to go out and work for themselves. While there was some initial opposition to women working and supporting the family, the old ideas quickly yielded to economic necessity; and today there is no stigma attached to such labor. All of these factors combined to change the relative status of husband and wife in the family away from patriarchal domination.

The traditional sanctity of the family, sanctioned by church marriage, was adversely affected. Adultery seems to have been a major by-product of moonshining. One gathers the impression that most of the moonshiners, both married and single,

"boozed away" their money in affairs with women from the countryside and neighboring towns.

The breakdown of the church as a social and community center, plus increased mobility and purchasing power, resulted in an outward movement for social activities. Within the memory of many persons, both the older type of social affair and the newer commercialized types coexisted for a while in Stringtown, until the latter finally achieved dominance in late whiskey and early post-whiskey days. The pattern of attending taverns, picking up girls, patronizing houses of prostitution, heavy drinking, and gambling seems to have begun in this period. Says an informant:

During the days when money was easy practically all of the younger men of the community were in regular attendance at sporting houses in *P* and *M*.

Now that the moonshining is over, it is instructive to consider the disposition of the moonshiners in the present social structure of Stringtown. One-half are on WPA and relief; one-third are sharecroppers; the others have migrated elsewhere. The majority could not go back to farming, even sharecropping, for lack of land and equipment.

Throughout the community and its

activities one can observe a fluid, amorphous class system. In this structure, the moonshiners seem to fall into the lower and middle ranges of the system, and the conservative, well off farmers occupy the higher niches. Corresponding to the rough class differentiation we can note certain differences in distribution throughout the activities of the community.

In connection with the church, as has been indicated above, the attendance and membership are drawn largely from the non-moonshiner families. Within the community there is a feeling that better people go to church, although this does not seem to stimulate the attendance of the non-churchgoers.

The cohesion and strength of family controls also seem to follow the general stratification lines. Most of the traditional family life is observed among the land-owning and better off families. A certain amount of friendly contact, cooperation, and solidarity is observed. Most of the changes reported for family structure are to be found in the former moonshining families. The youth in the latter group look outwards for a career; they migrate relatively frequently. On the other hand, the youth of the more conservative families still regard the land as their future occupation and work with their fathers.

Size As A Factor In Population Changes of Incorporated Hamlets and Villages, 1930-1940

By S. C. Ratcliffe*

ABSTRACT

Hamlets and villages are divided into four classes and the percentages which lost population computed.¹ The percentages increase as the size limits of classes decrease in 59.4 per cent of the areas tested. Causes of population changes are discussed; a review of the changes for five decades is presented; and a possible future development stated.

En este papel las aldeas han sido divididas en cuatro clases y los por cientos a cual han perdido poblacion computados.¹ Los por cientos se aumentan cuando las aldeas se decrecen en tamano, en 59.4 por ciento de las areas ensayados. Las causas de los cambios en el poblacion son discutidos en el papel; una revista de los cambios para cinco decadas es presentados; y un desarrollo posible para el futuro establecido.

The research upon which this report is based was conducted to test an hypothesis, namely, that "the smaller the place the greater is its liability to lose inhabitants, and the larger the place the less this liability."² The testing was done for the United States taken as a unit and for individual states, but was confined to data regarding *incorporated* hamlets and villages and to the decade 1930-1940.

In this report the term "hamlet" will mean a community with a population of less than 250 persons, and the term "village" will mean a community with a population of at least 250 but less than 2,500 persons.

* Professor of Sociology, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois.

¹The statistical data and its tabular organization is the work of Elizabeth Ratcliffe.

²Gillette, J. M., "Declining Villages of America and the Function of Communication in Their Improvement," *Proceedings of the Fourth National Country Life Conference, 1921*. University of Chicago Press, 1923, p. 29.

The number of incorporated hamlets and villages reported in the 1940 census is 13,288. Not all of them could be used, but only those for which population data were recorded for 1930 as well as for 1940. This eliminated 509, and left 12,779 as the object of our analysis. These were distributed into four categories on the basis of size; villages with populations of 1,000-2,499; 500-999; 250-499; and hamlets with populations of less than 250. During the decade studied 311 communities that were villages in 1930 had become urban places by 1940. These could not be neglected for as Kolb and Brunner very properly stated in *Rural Social Trends*, "It is easy to miss the real answer as to whether villages are growing unless identical places are followed through different census-taking years."³ In order to conform to this criterion these urban com-

³McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933, p. 73.

munities were added to the categories to which they had belonged in 1930 before any computations were made of the percentages of communities of each category which lost population during the decade. By adding these, our investigation involved a study of 13,090 incorporated communities.

When attention is directed to the number of incorporated hamlets and villages in each state, one is immediately impressed with the wide variation in numbers. Four states have no such communities while Illinois has nearly 1,000 of them. The distribution among states is most easily seen in tabular form and is presented in Table I.

percentages were 60.4 and 54.3 respectively. When hamlets alone were considered he found that less than five per cent of them were incorporated in each of twenty-one states while 31.9 per cent of them were incorporated in Nebraska and 27.2 per cent in Iowa. For the United States as a whole Landis reported the following percentages incorporated.

All hamlets and villages . . . 23.8
Large villages, 1,000-2,499 . . 70.1
Small villages, 250-1,000 . . 49.2
Hamlets 8.0⁴

These data should act a prophylactic against a too ready assumption that conclusions based on a study of incorporated hamlets and villages are

TABLE I. STATES FOR WHICH GIVEN NUMBERS OF INCORPORATED HAMLETS AND VILLAGES ARE LISTED IN THE BUREAU OF CENSUS REPORTS FOR 1940

None	Less than 25	25 to 100	101 to 200	201 to 300	301 to 400	401 to 500	501 to 600	601 to 700	701 to 800	801 to 900	901 to 1,000
Me. Mass. N.H. R.I.	Ariz. Conn. Nev.	Del. Mont. N.M. Vt. Wyo.	Cal. Idaho La. Md. N.J. Ore. S.C. Tenn. Utah Wash. W.Va.	Ala. Colo. Fla. Ky. Miss. S.D.	Ark. Mich. N.D.	Ind. Nebr. N.Y. N.C. Okla. Texas Wisc.	Ga. Kan. Ohio	Minn. Pa.	Mo.	Iowa	Ill.

The distribution revealed here suggests that hamlets and villages in some states seek incorporation more readily than do similar types of communities in other states. Landis studied this phenomenon for 1930 and found that in each of twelve states less than ten per cent of the hamlets and villages were incorporated while in Nebraska and Iowa comparable

necessarily valid for all hamlets and villages. Perhaps a sample which involves more than 13,000 units, approximately one quarter of the whole, is sufficient for that purpose. Never-

⁴Landis, Paul H., "The Number of Unincorporated Places in the United States and Their Estimated Populations," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, Vol. VI, No. 4, p. 175, Pullman, Washington, December, 1938.

theless we must bear in mind that the findings here reported are based on a study which limited its attention to *incorporated* hamlets and villages.

Table II presents some of the collected data organized so as to show the numbers of incorporated communities, classified according to size, in each state, and the number in each classification which lost population between 1930 and 1940. Table III is a record of the percentages of places of each category which lost population. It is this latter table which is used to test the validity or invalidity of the hypothesis being examined.

Table I shows that four states of the Union have no *incorporated* hamlets or villages as such communities were defined for this investigation. Three other states have less than 25 such communities each and another five states have less than 100 each.⁵ These twelve states were eliminated from our analysis. It should be said, however, that some of them conformed perfectly to the criterion employed to test the validity of our hypothesis. The test employed was that the percentages of incorporated hamlets and villages which lost population during the decade 1930-1940 should increase as one passed to the category of communities next smaller in size. As already stated, four categories were used.

When hamlet and village population changes are examined for the United States taken as a unit and for

the 36 individual states studied in this investigation, it is found that the criterion employed is conformed to without exception by the data for the United States and for 21 of the individual states, that is, for 59.4 per cent of the areas analyzed. In 12 of the remaining 15 states, that is, in 32.4 per cent of the areas analyzed, the percentages of loss deviate from the criterion in only one of the four categories into which communities were divided. That leaves only three states (8.1 per cent of the areas analyzed), Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, which seriously negate our hypothesis.

The hypothesis under discussion was presented as a conclusion before the American Country Life Association in 1921 by Professor J. M. Gillette.⁶ He had studied the population changes of incorporated places for the three decades between 1890 and 1920 and had been impressed by the correlation of size with growth or decline. The writer and Agnes Ratcliffe⁷ and also Professor Gillette⁸ studied this same hypothesis (or conclusion) for the decade 1920-1930. These studies, which covered four decades, classified incorporated places with less than 2,500 inhabitants into three categories only, and not into four. This was done by including hamlets and small villages under one category, namely, communities with less than 500 population. A similar category was included in the tables

⁵Eleven of these twelve states form two solid geographic areas, namely, New England, and a belt of "Mountain" states extending from the Canadian border to Mexico. Delaware stands by itself.

⁶See footnote 2.

⁷"Village Population Changes," *Am. J. Sociol.*, XXXVII, 760-767.

⁸*Rural Sociology*, N. Y.: Macmillan, 1936.

POPULATION OF HAMLETS AND VILLAGES

321

TABLE II. NUMBER OF INCORPORATED HAMLETS AND VILLAGES IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1940 BY STATES; NUMBER WHICH DECLINED IN POPULATION 1930-1940 BY STATES AND SIZES OF COMMUNITIES; AND NUMBER OF URBAN PLACES THAT WERE HAMLETS OR VILLAGES IN 1930.

State	Listed in 1940: No data 1930 (1)	Urban in 1940 but of Following Size in 1930				All Incorporated Villages and Hamlets (2)		Villages: 2,499-1,000 Population		Villages: 999-500 Population		Villages: 499-250 Population		Hamlets: 249-1 Population		Communities: 499-1 Population	
		2,499 to 1,000	999 to 500	499 to 250		Total	Lost Popu- lation	Total	Lost Popu- lation	Total	Lost Popu- lation	Total	Lost Popu- lation	Total	Lost Popu- lation	Total	Lost Popu- lation
		Number	Number	Number	Number												
United States	509	301	8	2	12779	4471	692	3152	692	3406	996	3584	1410	2637	1373	6221	2783
Alabama	11	8			209	76	12	61	12	67	24	53	16	28	16	81	40
Arizona	1	3			17	5	10	10	2	7	3						
Arkansas	26	5	1		333	139	21	57	19	75	19	93	38	108	61	201	99
California	8	14			110	26	11	76	7	20	7	10	6	4	2	14	8
Colorado	13	3			207	61	4	44	6	52	8	53	23	58	24	111	47
Connecticut					10	3	3	7	3	3							
Delaware	1	1	1		43	5	10	10	1	11	16	9	2	13	2	22	4
Florida	15	11	1	1	187	53	5	55	7	52	16	49	15	31	15	80	30
Georgia	12	13			501	205	16	93	16	109	26	140	66	169	97	299	163
Idaho	5	6			120	25	25	25	4	32	7	45	9	18	5	63	14
Illinois	19	18		1	913	282	54	276	62	327	62	274	107	146	59	420	166
Indiana	7	3			424	124	15	104	15	136	41	123	40	61	28	184	68
Iowa	16	8			826	275	128	128	21	208	56	266	95	224	103	480	198
Kansas	11	3			514	350	31	79	124	171	124	124	140	118	311	242	42
Kentucky	15	4			252	77	80	19	16	124	12	62	21	40	21	102	42
Louisiana	5	9			151	46	58	11	12	42	12	44	17	7	6	51	23
Maine	9				112	35	28	28	7	38	15	31	6	15	7	46	13
Maryland																	
Massachusetts																	
Michigan	15	9	2		345	69	118	118	19	105	15	96	24	26	10	122	34
Minnesota	18	7			649	96	119	119	5	148	6	196	25	186	60	382	85
Mississippi	6	9			241	94	57	113	11	70	32	62	25	52	26	114	51
Missouri	32	11	1		674	309	113	113	19	115	53	220	107	226	130	446	237
Montana	2	4	1		90	24	25	25	2	32	5	22	7	11	10	33	17
Nebraska	2	4			493	310	69	69	25	102	63	155	104	166	118	322	222
Nevada																	
New Hampshire																	
New Jersey	4	9			163	42	84	84	20	43	10	17	6	19	6	36	12
New Mexico	7	5	1		34	8	12	12	2	11	49	8	4	3	2	11	6
New York	21	6			387	149	146	146	51	137	23	78	28	26	21	104	49
North Carolina	5	8			406	107	95	95	13	104	23	117	26	90	45	207	71
North Dakota	9				312	145	36	145	8	58	13	104	53	114	71	218	124
Ohio	15	13			671	171	171	171	36	196	43	197	61	107	31	304	92
Oklahoma	14	9			431	231	88	231	36	99	50	133	75	111	70	244	145
Oregon	15	6			168	40	32	32	5	38	5	48	11	19	19	98	30
Pennsylvania	8	5			632	166	227	227	67	192	50	145	36	68	13	213	49
Rhode Island																	
South Carolina	6	10			192	64	53	53	6	36	11	47	17	56	30	103	47
South Dakota	5	4			279	148	37	148	24	64	24	77	47	101	66	178	113
Tennessee	6	9			158	50	47	47	7	48	17	42	17	21	9	63	26
Texas	75	33			374	143	171	171	43	133	60	66	39	15	11	81	59
Utah	49	4			117	29	37	37	4	45	12	32	10	8	3	35	13
Vermont	1	8			60	28	20	20	9	16	16	14	8	10	4	24	12
Virginia	6	8			159	52	42	42	11	48	10	47	18	22	13	59	31
Washington	8	2			176	60	45	45	11	58	16	50	19	23	14	73	33
West Virginia	8	5			156	58	61	61	22	48	21	32	12	15	8	47	16
Wisconsin	11	9			408	76	94	94	8	137	18	138	37	39	13	177	50
Wyoming	9	4			68	15	17	17		9	3	15	1	27	11	42	12

(1) Most of these communities became incorporated since 1930.

(2) Places urban in 1940 are not included.

TABLE III. PERCENTAGES OF INCORPORATED HAMLETS AND VILLAGES THAT LOST POPULATION DURING THE DECADE 1930-1940 BY STATES AND SIZES OF COMMUNITIES.

State	All Incorporated Places	Villages: 2,499-1,000	Villages: 999-500	Villages: 499-250	Hamlets: 250-1	Hamlets and Villages: 499-1
United States	34.1	20.0	29.7	39.3	52.0	44.7
Alabama	34.5	17.3	35.8	45.2	57.1	49.3
Arizona	25.0	15.3	42.8
Arkansas	41.1	33.8	25.3	40.8	56.4	44.2
California	20.9	12.2	35.0	60.0	50.0	57.1
Colorado	29.0	12.7	15.4	43.4	41.4	42.3
Connecticut	30.0	37.5	0.0
Delaware	11.1	9.1	0.0	22.2	15.4	18.1
Florida	26.6	10.6	30.1	30.0	48.3	40.5
Georgia	39.8	15.0	23.8	47.1	61.0	54.5
Idaho	20.0	13.3	21.9	20.0	27.7	22.2
Illinois	30.2	22.9	22.4	38.9	40.4	39.5
Indiana	29.0	14.0	30.1	32.5	45.9	36.9
Iowa	33.1	15.4	26.9	41.6	45.9	42.4
Kansas	67.6	37.8	61.0	72.5	84.2	77.8
Kentucky	30.0	22.6	22.8	33.8	52.5	41.1
Louisiana	28.7	16.4	28.5	38.6	85.7	45.1
Maine
Maryland	34.3	25.0	39.4	19.3	46.6	28.2
Massachusetts
Michigan	19.1	14.9	14.9	25.0	38.2	27.8
Minnesota	14.6	3.9	4.0	12.7	32.2	30.1
Mississippi	37.6	16.6	45.7	40.3	50.0	44.7
Missouri	45.0	15.3	45.6	48.6	57.5	53.1
Montana	25.2	6.9	15.1	31.8	90.9	51.5
Nebraska	62.3	34.2	61.7	66.6	71.0	68.9
Nevada	14.2	0.0	33.3
New Hampshire
New Jersey	23.8	21.5	23.2	35.2	31.5	30.0
New Mexico	20.0	11.7	0.0	50.0	66.6	54.5
New York	37.9	33.5	35.9	35.8	80.7	47.3
North Carolina	25.8	12.6	22.1	22.2	50.0	34.3
North Dakota	46.4	22.2	22.4	50.9	62.2	56.8
Ohio	25.0	19.5	21.9	30.9	28.9	30.2
Oklahoma	52.5	37.1	50.5	56.3	63.0	59.4
Oregon	22.9	13.1	13.1	22.0	39.5	30.6
Pennsylvania	26.0	28.8	26.0	24.8	19.1	23.0
Rhode Island
South Carolina	31.6	9.6	30.5	36.1	53.5	45.6
South Dakota	52.2	26.8	37.5	61.0	65.3	63.4
Tennessee	29.9	12.5	35.4	40.4	42.8	41.2
Texas	35.1	21.0	40.9	59.0	73.3	61.7
Utah	23.9	9.7	26.6	31.2	100.0	37.1
Vermont	46.6	45.0	43.7	57.1	40.0	50.0
Virginia	31.1	22.0	20.8	38.3	59.0	44.8
Washington	33.7	23.4	27.5	38.0	60.8	57.5
West Virginia	32.2	33.3	43.7	37.5	20.0	31.8
Wisconsin	18.2	7.7	13.1	26.8	33.3	28.2
Wyoming	20.8	0.0	33.3	6.6	40.7	28.5

prepared for this study in order that the data for 1930-1940 might be compared with those for earlier decades.

In testing our hypothesis for the decade covered by this study, we found, when we employed a three-fold instead of a four-fold system of classifying communities, that 27 of the states instead of only 22, that is 75.6 per cent of the areas analyzed, conformed perfectly to the criterion adopted as the test. Furthermore, six of the nine remaining states displayed a deviation from the criterion in relation to only one of the three categories into which communities were divided. Again only three states negate the criterion employed in the test.

Another way of gaining some appreciation of the extent to which hamlets and villages of various classes have lost population is to arrange states on the basis of the percentages of their communities which experienced population decline. Only the extreme percentage groupings are given, namely, losses of less than 20 per cent and of more than 60 per cent. The data are presented in table IV.

This table is noticeable for the concentration of states in the upper left and lower right hand areas. Such a pattern is due, of course, to the lower percentages of declining communities of the larger sizes and the higher percentages of declining communities of the smaller sizes.

A comparison of this table with one representing losses for the decade 1920-1930 would show that between 1930 and 1940 the number of

states in which less than 20 per cent of the hamlets and villages lost population, was more than twice as great as in the earlier decade. The figures are, for the last decade, 24 states listed in the low loss grouping, while the number for the earlier decade is only 11. These figures are based on a three-fold classification of communities and on an analysis of 36 states.

When losses exceeding 60 per cent are considered, the lists from the two decades are reversed. The 1920-1930 list contains 18 states while that for 1930-1940 contains only seven. These comparisons indicate that population decline in incorporated hamlets and villages was not so severe between 1930 and 1940 as it had been during the preceding ten year period. This point will be discussed later.

The investigation we are reporting was undertaken to ascertain the influence of size, on the growth or decline of incorporated hamlets and villages. Our findings have demonstrated that size is, in general, correlated with population growth or decline, but they have not established size as a direct cause of such changes.

The most recent effort to ascertain the causes of village growth or decline, so far as the present writer knows, was the work of David Ross Jenkins.⁹ One of the conclusions arrived at by him was that, "The size of the village is not an important factor in determining whether it will grow or decline."¹⁰ This conclusion is

⁹*Growth and Decline of Agricultural Villages*, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 88.

TABLE IV. STATES ARRANGED BY THREE EXTREME PERCENTAGE GROUPINGS OF INCORPORATED HAMLETS AND VILLAGES WHICH LOST POPULATION DURING THE DECADE 1930-1940 FOR COMMUNITIES OF VARIOUS SIZES.

Percentages of Communities Losing Population	Villages 2,499-1,000			Villages 999-500	Villages 499-250	Hamlets Less than 250	Communi- ties Less Than 500
Less than 20	Ala. Fla. Ind. Mich. Mo. S. C. Wisc.	Cal. Ga. Iowa Minn. N. C. Tenn.	Colo. Idaho La. Miss. Ore. Utah	Colo. Mich. Minn. Ore. Wisc.	Md. Minn.	Pa.	
60 to 80				Kan. Nebr.	Cal. Kan. Nebr. S. D.	Ga. Nebr. N. D. Okla. S. D. Texas Wash.	Kan. Nebr. S. D. Texas Wash.
Over 80						Kan. La. N. Y.	

not contradictory to the findings we have presented. It asserts that size, in itself, is not a direct cause of population changes: it does not deny the existence of a correlation between size and such changes.

Half a moment's reflection convinces one that there can be but two direct and immediate causes for the growth or decline of hamlets and villages. One of these is the balance between births and deaths; the other, the balance between *in* and *out* migration. Whatever factors influence these must be thought of as indirect causes. Lists of such factors can readily be made. The establishment of new businesses or industries, or the enlargement of those already in existence, tends to attract new residents while business failures have the opposite effect. An increase in the population of the area surrounding a village may be the factor that induces the establishment of new enterprises, while loss of such population may lead to failure among those already there. A rise in prices of farm

products, or the adoption of new agricultural techniques, or the discovery or exploitation of some hitherto undeveloped natural resource, may lead to a rise in the economic prosperity of the population on the land base of some village and thus induce new, or the enlargement of old enterprises. On the other hand, a decline in agricultural prices, or a drought, or the exhaustion of some natural resource, or a change in market demands, may destroy existing enterprises and lead to village decline. Contrary to what might be expected, Jenkins found, in some cases, that the factors which destroyed economic prosperity produced an increase in village populations. People moved into the villages to be near to the source of government relief.

Other factors which affect migration are all those techniques employed to attract patrons to the business, recreational, and social institutions of hamlets and villages. To the extent that those techniques are successful they make the communities con-

cerned attractive to their own residents and to possible new-comers. Contrarywise, failure to employ such techniques may result in *out* migration.

Factors affecting the vital statistics of hamlets and villages are: age and sex composition, marital status, and all agencies which affect birth and death rates. The combined influence of the factors which affect vital rates, Jenkins asserts, is of only minor importance compared with those that affect migration.¹¹

The list of indirect causes of hamlet and village population changes may be greatly extended. But those already named, together with the realization that certain of them which operate to produce population decline in some villages may stimulate population increase in others, force us to conclude that the only way to know the causes of population growth or decline would be to study each hamlet and village as a separate case. The result, one may confidently state, would always be a constellation of causal factors. The constellations would differ vastly from each other although some individual factors would appear with great frequency. In view of the findings of this investigation it may be definitely stated that the constellations of causes of population changes for hamlets and small villages will more often contain factors productive of population decline, and lack those which made for population increase, than will be the case for the larger villages. Size is not

in itself a cause of population change but the causes of population changes are, with a moderately high degree of consistency, related to size.

As further evidence of the correlation between size and population growth or decline the writer concurs in a conclusion first arrived at by Professor Paul Landis. Landis conducted a nation-wide statistical study of population changes of hamlets and villages which included unincorporated as well as incorporated places. He was, of course, perfectly aware that the validity of his findings was limited by the nature of the source material upon which his statistics depended. But his finding showed a decrease in number, between 1900 and 1930, of almost 19,000 hamlets and villages. "The decrease is accounted for," he said, "by the decline of hamlets."¹² His statistics show 21,200 less hamlets in 1930 than in 1900. Evidently two or more thousand of them must have disappeared by having become villages for the total loss of hamlets and villages in the 30 year period was 18,861. When Landis asserts that hamlets disappear he means that they cease to contain business establishments; he recognized that they did not necessarily disappear as places of residence.

The first American statistical study of hamlet and village population changes known to the present writer was conducted by H. E. Hoagland and published in 1912.¹³ It was limited to

¹¹*Op. Cit.*, p. 186.

¹²¹³"The Movement of Rural Population in Illinois," *The Journal of Political Economy*, XX, pp. 912-27.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 88.

the state of Illinois. Hoagland asserted that the numbers of hamlets and villages in any area was a function, mathematically speaking, of the means of communication at the time of their origin. Because so many hamlets and villages were founded when our rural economy was based on horse power, many of them, he predicted, would decline and disappear as the means of communication improved.

Since Hoagland made his prediction, many similar ones have been expressed. The findings by Landis indicate that such forecasts were warranted. However, by 1940 a different outlook for the future has come to be entertained by some of our leading rural sociologists, especially regarding the hamlets and villages that are trade centers for farmers. By the time that Professor T. Lynn Smith wrote his text-book, *The Sociology of Rural Life*, which was published in 1940,¹⁴ he had come to believe that *competition*, as the dominating relationship between farm trade centers had been largely superseded by a process of *accommodation*. As a consequence, rural trade centers of different sizes were learning to specialize on the types of services which each could best supply, and the farmers were learning to respond accordingly. This change of process, said Smith, leads, "to the belief that small centers are not doomed to extinction."¹⁵ His prediction of course, pertained to farm trade centers, and presumably was not meant to apply

to all hamlets and villages regardless of their economic means of support.

As a conclusion to our investigation of the hypothesis examined, table V is presented. It summarizes the findings of the studies of population changes of incorporated hamlets and villages for five decades. The table shows that for the four decades preceding the last one, the percentages of communities which suffered population decline increased as the population limits of those communities decreased. Furthermore, the table shows that with one slight exception, the percentages of loss increased with each succeeding decade. *Between 1930-1940 this latter trend was completely reversed.* The table shows that a smaller percentage of the largest villages lost population than in any of the preceding decades *of this century*. Of the villages of medium size a smaller percentage showed decline than in any of the other decades studied. The percentage of places of the smallest size which lost population fell back from a high point of 56.8 for the decade 1920 to 1930 to 44.7. This reversal of trends raises the question as to whether it is a consequence of the depressed economic conditions of the last decade or is a product of more permanent forces such as accompany population maturity.

The answer to the above inquiry cannot be given until more decades have elapsed. However, some facts are known that suggest what the future might hold. It is known that farm net reproduction rates indicate a large surplus farm population for

¹⁴Harper and Brothers, 1940.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 496.

TABLE V. NUMBER OF INCORPORATED PLACES IN THE UNITED STATES WITH LESS THAN 2,500 POPULATION AND NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES WHICH DECLINED DURING EACH OF FIVE DECADES, BY SIZE OF COMMUNITY¹

Population	1890-1900 Number		1900-1910 Number		1910-1920 Number		1920-1930 Number		1930-1940 Number		PERCENTAGES WHICH DECLINED				
	Counted	Declined	Counted	Declined	Counted	Declined	Counted	Declined	Counted	Declined	1890- 1900	1900- 1910	1910- 1920	1920- 1930	1930- 1940
2,499-1,000	1,634	291	2,114	587	2,786	798	3,171	890	3,404	686	17.8	27.8	28.6	28.0	20.1
999-500	1,908	605	2,436	780	3,192	1,166	3,208	1,419	3,355	986	31.5	31.9	36.6	44.2	29.3
Less than 500	2,757	694	4,073	1,339	5,605	2,261	5,964	3,389	6,143	2,757	25.2	32.8	40.3	56.8	44.7
Total	6,299	1,590	8,623	2,706	11,583	4,225	12,343	5,698	12,984	4,446	25.2	31.3	36.4	46.1	34.2

¹Compiled from publications by J. M. Gillette; S. C. and Agnes Ratcliffe; and from data collected for the present investigation.

the next few decades. Mechanization of agriculture, and the lack of any prospects of a large increase in the demand for agricultural products, indicate that the farms will not need the surplus population being reared there. That surplus may, then, migrate to rural hamlets and villages or to urban centers. During the last intercensal decade, for the first time in American history, more than a quarter of our cities exceeding 100,000 inhabitants, 29.1 per cent to be exact, experienced population decline.¹⁶ This may have been due to a process of decentralization. The present war with its emphasis on aerial

bombardment may stimulate that process still further. The result of these two factors, that is, of surplus farm population and urban decentralization, may be an increased migration to hamlets and villages. Should this be the case, the trend which appeared during the last decade toward smaller percentages of declining hamlets and villages may continue. Admittedly there are many unknowns which may invalidate this prediction.

¹⁶Gillette, J. M., "Some Population Shifts in the United States, 1930-1940," *The American Sociological Review*, Vol. 6, No. 5, p. 621.

NOTES

Edited by Paul H. Landis

ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS BEING CARRIED ON IN THE FIELD OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY EXTENSION

Report of a survey made by the 1941 Extension Committee of the Rural Sociological Society.*

The 1941 Executive Committee of the Rural Sociological Society asked the extension committee of the Society to bring together "a brief statement of approximately one hundred words concerning the activities and program of each extension sociologist." Obviously it would be necessary to gather such information through correspondence. It was hoped that the replies would be of such quality as to justify dis-

tribution in mimeograph form among interested members of the society and the extension workers who contributed. The 1941 extension committee undertook this assignment.

In order that somewhat comparable information might be secured a general questionnaire form was worked out. This questionnaire was sent, with a personal letter, to each of the 106 persons listed as having extension responsibility in the October, 1940 list of *Personnel in Rural Sociology: Teachers, Research Workers, Extension Workers* prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S.D.A. Those who did not reply within three months were then sent a follow-up

* This committee consists of D. E. Lindstrom, B. L. Hummel, and A. F. Wileden, chairman.

letter. At the time of this writing replies have been received from 63 of the 106 individuals who were questioned. Of these, 13 individuals reported as doing no extension work in Rural Sociology.

Twenty-six States Report Carrying on Work in Rural Sociology Extension—Fifty individuals reported doing some extension work in rural sociology. These 50 individuals represented twenty-six states. This includes all except two of the states that reported carrying on extension work in this field in 1935.¹ These two states were South Dakota and West Virginia. The present reports include twelve states not reporting such extension work in 1935. They include eight states now carrying on some such extension work from Agricultural Colleges that did not report such work in 1935. These states are Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon and Rhode Island. It is, to be regretted that a complete response was not secured in the present questioning, thus making possible a more accurate indication of the trends in the development of this field as a phase of agricultural extension work.

It is significant, however, to note the overwhelming preponderance of such extension work being carried on from the Agricultural Colleges. Of the 50 replies received, 42 were from Agricultural Colleges. The remaining eight were from Catholic Church Schools and Teachers Colleges. None of the latter were full time extension assignments, whereas about two-thirds of the former were full time appointments.

No Uniform Title Is Used by Workers Reporting within This Field—The workers were asked to indicate the actual title they use in connection with their extension work. There is no one uniform title used by workers reporting within this field. However, of those used, that of "extension rural sociologist" is by far the most frequent, reported by about one-third of the workers.

¹For this report see "Rural Sociology Extension in the Agricultural Colleges," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, March, 1939.

There are a number of other titles closely related to it, such as, "specialist in rural sociology," "extension specialist in community organization and recreation," "rural organization specialist," and "extension sociologist in rural women's organizations." All together these comprise over half of the individuals reporting.

The other titles are a large variety of either more specialized or related titles. Some of the more specialized titles are "rural music specialist," "community music specialist," "extension group discussion specialist," "community drama specialist," "group discussion and community drama specialist," and drama director." The related titles include "extension social economist," "assistant in 4-H club work," "extension field agent," "extension specialist in land use planning," "professor of philosophy and sociology," "professor of economics," and "extension class teacher and rural visitor." There is probably some question whether the work reported under some of these titles should be included within the scope of this questioning. The defense is that they have been so included in the list prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and that the individuals reporting believed they should be included. It appears that much work being done under the guise of rural sociology, certainly in its applied phases, is at the present time as much on a boundary between other fields as within a field of its own. This once more raises the muted question of the field of rural sociology and of rural sociology extension, a question still in need of study and evaluation.

It is of interest to note that the generalized titles relating to rural sociology, as well as the more specialized titles, are used in connection with the work emanating from the Agricultural Colleges. On the other hand, the related titles tend to be used in connection with work extended from other than the agricultural colleges and when the work is carried on by part time extension workers.

The Work Is Preponderantly Financed Through Public Funds—Extension work in

this field is preponderantly financed through public funds. About half of the workers reporting in this inquiry said that their efforts were financed partly by federal and partly by state or local funds. An additional one fourth said their work was financed entirely by federal funds. About one-eighth reported financing from all state or local funds and about an equal number reported all private funds. Apparently the use of federal funds or of federal and state funds for financing work in this field of extension meets with federal approval. Apparently, also, the states welcome federal aid in carrying on rural sociology extension work.

There is a difference in this matter of financing, however, between the agricultural and other colleges carrying on work in this field. Only two representatives from agricultural colleges reported the use of any private funds. One of these was a rural music specialist and the other was an extension specialist in community organization and recreation. On the other hand, five of the eight individuals reporting doing work from other than agricultural colleges said they were financed entirely by private funds. Only one reported securing any federal funds.

About Half of the Workers Give Their Full Time to Extension—Of the fifty workers replying, twenty-four reported giving their full time to extension work. All of these workers represented agricultural colleges. On the other hand, there is quite a proportion of workers who give less than half of their time to extension work. This includes about one-third of all those reporting work in this field and about one-fourth of those reporting from the Agricultural Colleges.

Obviously this raises the issue, uppermost in the minds of many extension administrators, as to how a person can do effective extension work when at the same time tied down to routine academic teaching or research responsibilities. On the other hand it raises the question as to how they can keep abreast of developments in their field when year after year they devote full time to extension work. Obviously this is one of the unsolved problems that needs attention. It

involves problems of coordination between the three branches of teaching, research, and extension within the field of rural sociology itself.

Community Organization Activities Comprise Major Emphasis—Inquiry was made about the current plans of work—the program and activities being carried on. Both concise and lengthy replies were received. A check list of activities prepared from the replies themselves revealed thirty-nine different items. Some of these were reported frequently and others only occasionally.

It is obvious that those receiving major emphasis are what we might group as community organization activities. These include activities that help provide rural people with the means whereby through their own group effort they can get what they want such as obtaining local organizations of many kinds, making local self-surveys, local group planning, and training local leaders. They also include activities that from the outside help provide group organization for rural people in order to make available to them what outside people believe they need. The most frequent activity listed was concerned with leadership development and training, indicated in about half of the replies. The other community organization activities most frequently reported were group planning (including organization and land use planning), bringing about closer cooperation between different organizations and agencies, older youth organization, strengthening the rural church, and making social studies and surveys. These were all listed in 20% or more of the replies.

There is a significant difference in the specific activities reported by representatives from the Agricultural Colleges and from the other schools. The latter give a much greater proportionate emphasis to strengthening the rural church, to making social studies and surveys, and to older youth organization work than do the representatives from the Agricultural Colleges. On the other hand the Agricultural College representatives give much more attention to leadership development and training, to group planning, and to bringing about a

closer cooperation between different organizations and agencies.

There appear to be some interesting trends in emphasis taking place as indicated by a comparison of the data reported in this inquiry and the data gathered from all of the states carrying on such extension work six years ago.² Work on social surveys and analysis was more frequently reported in 1935 than it is today. At the present time group planning, efforts in bringing about closer cooperation between organizations and agencies, and older youth organization work are much more frequently reported.

Programs for Rural Communities and Organizations Receive Much Attention —

The other significant emphasis today is the work of providing programs and program materials for rural communities and for rural organizations. These activities, of course, have other motives as well as the above. These motives include the providing of a richer social and cultural life for rural people, teaching people how to think and how to become better citizens in a democracy, the development of the individual, and the making available to rural groups technical material in agriculture and home economics. Much of the subject matter of these activities is from fields other than sociology, particularly other college of agriculture and home economics departments, speech, physical education, and departments of music. This emphasis is probably a part of rural sociology extension programs today for two reasons: first, it is the work of the rural sociologists that has often revealed that rural people want and need what these fields have to offer; and second, it is administratively expedient at this time to extend these offerings as a part of the rural sociology extension program.

The specific program field most frequently reported today is that of group discussion. It is probably not accurate to call this an activity. It is more of a method of approach just as community organization is

a method of approach. Individuals who make a democratic approach to rural people must of necessity use the discussion method. Discussion was reported about as frequently today as it was in the 1935 study.

The next most frequently listed program activities were social recreation, educational programs for rural organizations, and setting up meetings and demonstrations. These were reported by 20% or more of the individuals. Next in order were drama and pageantry, issue a program service, help with camps, and music. The significant difference today as compared with reports from all of the states in 1935 is the decrease in the frequency with which work in drama is reported.

*Summary*³—We can now briefly summarize the findings of this inquiry as follows:

1. Present programs in the field of rural sociology extension are comprised of two types of activities; those that help rural people to get what they want or what other people think they need, and program materials for rural communities and rural organizations. These two types of activities together comprise the field of rural community organization, and at present seem to be complimentary to each other. Furthermore, it seems administratively proper that they be carried on together.
2. These activities recognized as rural community organization make up a central field that seems to be emerging, known as "rural sociology extension." At least that title is becoming more generally recognized.
3. Federal aid is very influential in developing and carrying on work in this field of rural sociology extension.
4. The matter of part time versus full time extension involves careful coordination and planning in the field of rural sociology itself.

³Supplementary to this report are one page replies from each of the fifty individuals contributing to this present study. These replies provide the basis for the above report. They can be separately mimeographed and made generally available if there is desire or need for them.

²"Rural Sociology Extension in the Agricultural Colleges (1935)," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, March, 1939.

5. Work in this field of extension is becoming more extensive over the United

States, particularly through the Agricultural Colleges.

AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION BY MEANS OF FILMS AND FORUMS

To bring the full story of Canada at war to isolated rural areas by means of films, has been the aim of an experiment in adult education fostered by the National Film Board of Canada. The object at the same time has been to stimulate community discussion regarding the objectives of the war. Concentration has been placed on motion pictures explaining Canada's part in industrial, agricultural and armaments production. The project began in January 1942, and by June, forty-three travelling theatres using 16 mm. portable projectors were in operation. Over two hundred and fifty thousand persons attended these rural showings each month. This winter it is expected that as many as seventy mobile 16 mm. units will be on tour, and that the total audience reached will be twice as large.

The Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship has cooperated from the start. Funds have been given the Film Board by the Dominion Office of Public Information, and in addition, eight provincial Departments of Education and seven University Departments of Extension are assisting.

The travelling theatres operate on circuits, each one reaching twenty communities monthly. Each village served knows that the free films will return on the same day each month. There are afternoon showings for children and evening ones for adults. Community participation has proved encouraging. Besides locally sponsored talks, there are many platform discussions and forums. Thus in Manitoba, where large settlements peopled by farmers of German and Ukrainian origin, are on the circuits, there comes the following report from a field representative of the Film Board:

"A group of five to seven local citizens consented to take the platform with me

during a half-hour intermission in the middle of the film programme, for a round-table discussion. The intermission followed the picture "Tools of War" which provided an excellent jumping-off place for the discussion of issues connected with our war effort. The Canadian part of the picture impresses people with the amount Canada is already doing (many were very surprised) and the German part impresses them with the much greater amount that must yet be done. The general theme of the round-table discussions was "How We Can Increase Our War Effort." Criticism was not lacking but was usually quite intelligent, and the discussions always took a decidedly positive direction. Very constructive consideration of social issues relating to the war came to the fore at several places. There was evidence of the discussions not only stimulating general interest in public issues, but increasing the people's feeling of the possibility of taking more initiative and responsibility in their own communities for making democracy more effective.

"The liveliness of the round-table discussions surprised the people themselves and when the discussion was thrown open to everyone present as a general forum, the contributions from the audience were equally vigorous. I believe we have something in this set-up of great potentiality in utilizing the documentary film as a basis for a vital kind of democratic adult education."

The projectionists serve remote districts by train, by automobile, and sometimes during snow storms, by sleigh. Where electric power is not available, portable generating units are used.

In general, the circuits have been re-

stricted entirely to rural areas. Only here and there are villages or towns of as many as one thousand inhabitants included. The films therefore go to regions which do not usually see motion pictures, in fact one report from the Lac St. Jean district in Quebec states that over ninety per cent of the audience had never heard or seen a sound film before.

As far as initial organization was concerned, in each community served, a committee was formed in advance to arrange for a hall, to conduct publicity, and, in co-operation with the Canadian Council of Education for Citizenship, to choose a speaker to give a few remarks to accompany the films. Posters and lecture notes for speakers are sent to these committees ahead of time.

The notes include discussion outlines both for forum and group leaders, and for

teachers. Thus in the programme for October, where the principal film is to be "Food, Weapon of Conquest," the notes will stress not only the significance of the farmer's role in the war, but will also raise more detailed questions. One such question to be included in the "Points for Chairman" is, "How can your community make a maximum use of its available manpower and machinery, so that agricultural production may be strengthened during the war."

Most of the films being used in this Canadian experiment are also available to United States educators and information concerning them can be obtained from the New York University Film Library, New York, and the College Film Centre, 59 East Van Buren St., Chicago, Illinois.

D. W. BUCHANAN.

National Film Board, Canada.

PANEL PROCEDURES IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY

It is 1942—at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia. Fifty students in Rural Planning are milling around in a large classroom—five minutes before the beginning of class. A group of 10 is arranging chairs in a semi-circle in the front of the room. These students are *panelites* on the day's program. Members of another group are discussing the panel topic scheduled for next time. The chairman is asking for suggestions, making assignments, and otherwise outlining procedure. Conversation is present—the air is informal, chatty.

Five minutes later the class has settled down. Panel members are seated. They face the class, but are more or less unaware of its existence. They are talking among themselves. The chairman is guiding the discussion. He is asking questions which bring out divergent views on the subject under debate. He objects vigorously to a point which one student makes, and an argument is underway. Two minutes later he steps into the picture again and shifts the conversation. During the next 25 minutes, each member of the panel contributes *something*—an idea,

opinion, factual data, disagreement, approval, or whatever else may be original with him, yet based on fact and not on hearsay.

From 10 to 15 minutes before the class hour is over, the panel chairman opens the discussion to class participation. Six to a dozen hands are raised, and questions are directed either to the chairman or to specific members of the panel. Rarely does the end of the hour find any situation except one in which interest is high in many questions which have been brought up by the panel—often the class splits into several small groups to continue discussion for some minutes after class.

This situation—in contrast to the standardized lecture course—is heartily approved by the students. Not only do students approve of panels; they actually do considerably more work in panel preparation than if the same material were "handed out to them" or if they were asked to do "collateral reading" in connection with regular classroom procedure.

Organizing a class for effective panel procedure requires a considerable amount of

time at the beginning of a school term. After the panels have begun to function, organizational work tapers off, though it is always worthwhile to work individually with panel chairmen in outlining forthcoming panels.

At Virginia Polytechnic Institute, in the Rural Planning Class this Spring Quarter, 1942, the following procedure was used:

First, each student is given a mimeographed sheet which explains the purpose of panels as follows:

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

The panel discussion is a public conversation. In this public conversation all viewpoints and information concerning a subject are talked over by members of a panel.

The chairman, in advance of the meeting, assigns certain phases of the subject to each member of the panel for specific study, although every member should be prepared to take part in the discussion as a whole.

The panel is seated in group form with the chairman at one end and the discussion is directed to the panel *only* until time for audience participation. The chairman opens the discussion and guides the "conversation" in order that all sides of the question may be presented. No set speeches are made; the panel merely talking back and forth with the informality typical of any social group which might be discussing news of the day with the chairman as host. The discussion is conducted through questions, answers, personal opinions and authoritative statements. More effective presentation is secured without the use of notes, but if desired they may be used—sparingly. Thorough study in advance will enable members to *think aloud*, and will add much to the effectiveness of the program. *Written speeches are as much out of place as they would be in a fireside gathering.*

At the end of a set time (30 or 40 minutes) the chairman invites the audience to take part in the discussion. Members of the audience may contribute questions, opinions or information on any phase of

the subject. They may direct their questions to the chairman or to any member of the panel. The audience should give thought to the program in advance and be ready to participate, since interest is increased by a variety of opinions.

After the question has been fully discussed, or at the expiration of an allotted time, the chairman closes the discussion with a brief summary of the information presented. No conclusion as such is stated, since the purpose of the program is not to form definite conclusions, but to arouse interest and stimulate further study.

When properly presented as a group-talk (not a group-lecture) the panel discussion is a very satisfactory form of study, since it encourages response from all members. We learn more from a program in which we take part, and this method of presentation is good training in intellectual and social development.

In addition, a paper listing specific "*Do's and Don'ts*" for panel chairmen, panel members, and the audience is distributed.

Second, a list of from 50 to 100 suggested topics for panel discussions is outlined, including suggestions from students.

Third, each student is allowed to choose one panel of which he is to be chairman, and four additional panels on which he is to be a member.

Fourth, a mimeographed "Rural Planning Program" is prepared, listing the panel topics, dates of presentation, chairmen and members of each panel. Every student receives two copies of this program—one for himself and one for an interested friend.

Fifth, after a panel has been presented, the chairman prepares a one-page typewritten report covering material presented, topics discussed, conclusions reached, and any other pertinent data he may wish to include.

Sixth, this report is edited, mimeographed, and copies distributed to each class member, thus serving as a sort of permanent record, and at the same time promoting some friendly competition among panel chairmen.

Sample panel topics in the current Rural Planning class at V.P.I. include:

1. *The Past: Some Historical Points:*

- The Farm and Feudalism
- The Homestead Act
- World War I and American Industry

2. *The Present:*

- Planning Implications of Decentralization of Industry
- Modern Frontiers in Farming
- Twentieth Century Technocracy
- New Horizons in Rural Education
- Religion as a Base for Social Planning
- Planning for Health Through Socialized Medicine
- The Menace of Farm Tenancy
- Planning for Effective Recreation
- Rural Electrification
- World Planning Through a League of Nations
- TVA and Regional Planning

—Planning Through Community Organization

3. *The Future:*

—Probable Effects of World War II on Rural Planning

At V. P. I., sociology panels are resulting in more adequate classroom performance by students. More than that, students are receiving valuable aid in development of the sadly neglected art of conversation. Again, students are learning to work together on committees—in groups—in situations strikingly similar to those in which they will later participate in their own communities. Also, interests and discussion expressed in the class carry over to life outside the class—one final test of any educative process.

JOHN NEWTON BAKER.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

 THE INNOCENT EYE

In the eighteenth century, writers like Swift in *Gulliver's Travels* and Voltaire in *Candide* used the innocent eye of a naive observer, free from the impedimenta of sophistication and learning, to view society. This old device seems well fitted to the needs of modern descriptive sociology, for no innocent eye can be more accurate, more revealing, than the camera.

Of course, there are limitations to the use of photography in sociological research. It can indicate *what?* But never *why?*, *how?*, *what should be done about it?*, or *what will happen?* All these answers properly come after photographic description.

But there remain excellent reasons for its use. Photography can provide a firm foundation for theory. It can clothe with flesh the bare bones of statistical findings. It can assist observation, for often a still picture can show in its true importance a factor perhaps ignored by the observer. Pictures add an interest which may capture readers for research deserving of wide publication. Typical examples of people, houses, groups, and institutions may be presented, and these will render yet more practicable

comparisons of research results in different sections of the country. Thus it becomes as useful a method of the natural sciences as Audubon's.

In the hands of a trained sociologist, photography may come into high estate. What is needed is not the snapping of "cheesecake," nor of scenery from odd angles, nor of squalor, nor of the most accessible materials. There is no room here for either the sensationalism of *You Have Seen Their Faces* nor the unreal beauty of a photographic calender. It is particularly suitable for a community survey in which the sociologists can select pictures of those factors like education, religion, housing, agricultural practices, health practices, food, and group meetings, which will give a comprehensive representation.

Since the authors have been engaged in this work for the Nutrition Division of the Federal Security Agency, primarily as sociologists and secondarily as photographers, some practical suggestions are here offered.

METHOD

The sociologist must, of course, plan his entire study, then decide what elements of the social situation can be well shown photographically. He composes a shooting script for himself, or, if he is lucky, for his photographer. This script may make allowance for various types of pictures desired. "Still" pictures in black-and-white are most practical for reproduction in pamphlet form, books, magazine articles, and newspapers. Still pictures in 35 mm. size in black-and-white or color are most useful for filmstrips, for auditorium presentation on a screen. It may seem ambitious to make a movie, but the excellent Sloan Foundation films and those of Pare Lorenz indicate what might be done on a lesser scale in a twenty minute film.

For these three types of photography our equipment includes: a $3\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ Speed Graphic equipped with range finder and synchronized flash gun, a 35 mm. Contax F1:2, a 16 mm. magazine Cine-Kodak, Super XX film packs, 35 mm. Kodachrome film and 16 mm. magazines, yellow filters and hoods for the still cameras, No. 21 flash bulbs, two blue photoflood No. 2 bulbs and reflectors for indoor movies. Much less equipment than this can be advantageously used.

With reading and practice an intelligent person can very shortly develop the skill of the average press photographer. While many magazines and manuals can help (such as *Morgan's Graphic-Graflex Photography*), there is little material on dealing with individuals and groups. In these suspicious times it is essential to carry credentials, to ask permission for photographing and publication, and to be locally introduced for taking group pictures. It is always best to talk with individuals first, then ask permission after a while to make a photograph.

What to avoid photographically will be soon apparent. After the technical details are mastered for good clear pictures, one must still beware of still, posed pictures of old darkies standing around with hat in hand or of inanimate objects, unless one is seeking documentation of a special nature.

Farm Security Administration pictures so widely published provide a model in their human interest, their ingenuity, and their pictorial quality.

It seems to us that there are two particular, relatively pioneer ways in which sociologists may use photography.

The first is in the portrayal of *group* life. The assembly and interaction of individuals in community gatherings can, to some extent, be reduced to paper. Vast possibilities lie in this photography of meetings (P.-T. A.'s, barn dances, social clubs), communal work (quilting, tobacco-grading), institutions (churches, schools), meetings between socially conflicting individuals or groups (servant and mistress, whites and Negroes, villagers and farmers).

To illustrate, we photographed that very important dispenser of medicines and medical advice to country people, the town druggist, in the act of giving both to a group of Negro women gathered in his back room. Not only is that situation illustrated by the picture itself but also subsidiary points we had not at first observed: the fact that he had sat down with the white "patients"; their expressions and attitudes of utter trust and submission; as well as lesser physical details like the prominence of the nicotinic acid for pellagra, the boxes of a northern pharmaceutical supply house, and the general neatness and cleanliness of the place.

To modern high speed cameras we owe the second use—the portrayal of life in motion. Here may we catch the protoplasm of organized society in the act of expanding and contracting. If the movie camera is on the spot, it can follow the preparation of a meal by a rural housewife who has to be more concerned with not letting her dinner burn than with the camera. It can record the unrehearsed arrangement of terms between the sharecropper and his landlord, of trading from the traveling grocery truck, or of the democratic procedure in a community meeting. Not only is this possible for the movie camera but also for the high speed cameras which can easily stop action at speeds above 1/200 of a second. Flashlight bulbs, too, and simple apparatus for indoor

movies extend the area from daylight to any phase of indoor activity, an advantage that becomes especially useful where there are no electric lights.

The portrayal of group life and of life in action becomes the more authentic when one remembers that no naive society is sufficiently good at acting to hide its true reactions in an unrehearsed situation. Certainly it will be a more reliable record than at present given at second-hand through the eyes of a fallible observer.

Sociological photography is still only a

visual record. Some are experimenting with sound track, but even so, the other senses are still lacking. Incomplete a device as it is, it has still vast potentialities for those interested particularly in descriptive sociology, community surveys, or any tangible aspect of research. Surely the camera's innocent eye is a useful and perhaps neglected adjunct to the trained eye of the sociologist.

MARGARET T. CUSSLER,
MARY L. DE GIVE.

Federal Security Agency.

ON FAMILY SIZE FARMS

In the December 1941 issue of *RURAL SOCIOLOGY* Edgar Schmiedeler suggests that the American ideal of farm families on family size farms may be giving way to large scale operations and small subsistence plots. If this be true, rural sociologists will be interested. However, unless investigation is more rigorous and unless there is a greater awareness of the assumptions involved than is evident in the same article, we shall likely arrive at some inaccurate and unwarranted conclusions which may lead to unwise action.

Although numerous persons would hold that the economic efficiency of technological and large scale developments outweighs any accompanying loss of other human values, the following comments are based on the assumption that the family size farm ought to be preserved.

First, What is a family size farm? Rev. Schmiedeler bases much of his argument upon impressive sum totals of numbers of farms of certain sizes for the United States as a whole. This method implies that a farm of so many acres in one region is comparable to a farm of the same size in another, or that one acre represents about as many man-hours of labor and as much income as any other. Certainly an acre of lettuce, one of corn, and one of buffalo grass cannot be equated. A stock ranch which may be too small to support a family may con-

tain so many acres that if they were all one unit in an area of more intensive use, several families might well be employed upon them. Regional, State, local, or at least more homogeneous data than national summaries will have to be used to compare acreages for the purpose of designating farms as family size or otherwise. Even within a State acreages often will not be comparable from one farming type to another.

One assumes certain things when speaking of the family size farm, for besides acreage and type of farming, other factors enter into the concept. Surely it implies that the farm ordinarily will provide the operating family with a living. Immediately the whole field of standards and levels of living becomes relevant, and we are confronted with various cultural and community ideas as to what the standard should include and with countless existing levels of living, without mentioning price changes.

Perhaps everyone would agree that a family size farm is one which a family can handle without too much help from outside the family. However, in making a study one would have to decide who is included in the family and just how much non-family help is too much. The situations of two or more generations living on the same farm, the married hired man who is separately housed, the single hired man in the home, heavy influxes of seasonal labor, frequent and nec-

essary hiring of occasional labor, child labor, the gentleman farmer, and other social arrangements will present problems to be solved when delimiting the concept.

If the same work day and season are retained, mechanization may facilitate "the cultivation of larger acreages by individual operators or by corporate groups." And it probably is true that really to make machines pay they must be used on larger acreages than their operators could handle without them. But even though mechanization enlarges acreages, it does not inevitably destroy the family size farm. It may merely make "the home place" larger. If mechanization permits half the farmers of an area to double their acreage, the displaced farmers will in all likelihood become a problem to society, assuming that the increase of the former is made at the expense of the latter. (It may be that some of the urban unemployed also represent technological displacements.) But the remaining farmers, if they work no longer and hire no more labor than they did before, will be as much operators of family size farms as they previously were, unless we make the concept a static one. So if we protest the enlargement of the family size farm let us realize that we are condemning the labor saving efficiency of a bigger plow, for the plow may still be "in the hands of the owner." Accepting many mechanical changes and keeping American farmers owner-operators, need not be mutually exclusive.

Farm management specialists frequently advise farmers that to make a profit they must enlarge their unit of operation. The Tolan Committee includes a recommendation that certain Dust Bowl livestock farms should be expanded to 1,800 or 3,000 acres to be family size.¹ Master Farmers, perhaps by definition, usually operate larger than average farms. Landless migrants, victims of land enclosures, excessive birth rates, or

whatever, can and do represent a serious social problem. But it must not be forgotten that owner-operators on farms too small or on land too poor to support them according to "minimum standards" hardly represent the American ideal either.

The length of the working day and season, like technological development, is one of the variables that define the family size farm. The same family with the same machines can operate different size farms by changing their working day. Or the same family on the same size and type of farm might be able to shorten its working day with different machinery, if the farmer can be induced to alter his folkways.

If, in these days of increasing social control, there may be some effort to preserve the family size farm, it has been my purpose to point out that the concept is not amenable to blanket categorization over large or heterogenous areas. Rev. Schmiedeler may be wholly correct when he says that large scale operations are increasing in number, acreage, and importance, although his figures do not prove it. "Mechanization is growing consistently, . . . and little if anything is being done to stop it." True, cultural lag may be eliminated by adopting the Ghandi philosophy and rejecting a higher standard of living made possible by mechanical power. But do social scientists and planners lack the wit to devise means to direct and utilize that power? Efforts to "avert catastrophe in the history of rural America" must also affect or consider levels of living, working hours, proper land use, and the possible outlawing of improvement in the arts.

ROBERT A. ROHWER.

University of Wisconsin.

REJOINDER TO MR. ROHWER

I find little in Mr. Rohwer's comments on the article I contributed to the December, 1941 issue of *RURAL SOCIOLOGY* on which to base a rejoinder. His comments are more an elaboration of my article than anything else. For the most part he discusses the concept of a family-size farm, a matter that I had taken to be utterly unnecessary for the type

¹Testimony of Edwin R. Henson, Coordinator, United States Department of Agriculture, Amarillo, Texas, in *Hearings before the Select House Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens*. Washington: Gov't Print. Office, 1941, Part Five, pp. 1770-1771.

of individual that reads RURAL SOCIOLOGY. Indeed, I felt it was obvious to practically anyone and everyone that the raising of certain crops called for a smaller acreage per family than the raising of other crops, that greater mechanization could mean a shorter work day, that a change in the number of farms might mean a change in standards of living, etc. At any rate there is no difficulty whatever in accepting Mr. Rohwer's conclusion on this score: "The concept (of the family-size farm) is not amenable to blanket categorization over large or heterogeneous areas."

However, I thought I had made it reasonably clear that there was a difference between either a latifundium, so common in history, or a baronial estate, not uncommon in history, or a large industrialized or mechanized farm of our day, and what has commonly been taken to be an American family-size farm. It seemed crystal clear to me too that, if for example, a half dozen farms had for years been the source of a satisfactory living to six families, and those farms were combined into one farm, furnishing a living for only one family, something has happened to the American family-size farm. I consider it a very serious matter when families who for years made their living on the land lose their farms because of an increasing concentration of acreage.

Perhaps the most critical thing Mr. Rohwer says is that my article does not "prove" that large scale operations are increasing. I had thought that it did offer about the amount of proof that would be expected in a short article. I might say that I have developed the whole subject under discussion a bit further in a 32-page booklet of the National Catholic Welfare Conference entitled *Vanishing Homesteads*; in case he or anyone else wishes to explore my views at least a little further. Presumably a large volume could be written on the subject. Aside from the question of proof—and there are so many things that are true although unproved—I wish to state it as my

firm conviction, based on considerable study and observation, that there is a definite drift towards large-scale farming that is bound to have very unwholesome repercussions. I hope we will not wait until matters have actually gone so far that we can offer proofs in terms of millions before something is done to arrest the development.

Such issues as economic efficiency versus social values and standards of living are raised by Mr. Rohwer. I believe I have fairly definite views on these matters. Economic efficiency may not necessarily destroy social values. But often it does. And when it does I stand by social values. The whole consideration of economic efficiency is hardly separable from the question of standards of living. Only too often economic efficiency in the United States has meant higher standards, even a surfeit, for the few, and lower standards, even less than sufficient, for the many. In speaking of our vaunted American standards I think it is well not to lose sight, for example, of our share-croppers of whom the Vice-President has very correctly said that they were worse off than the peasants of Europe. To have a landed aristocracy at the top of the agricultural ladder and many families on the rungs circulating down towards the bottom of the ladder, and even entirely off of it, does not at all appeal to me. My idea of the standard of living is closely linked with that of the common good—first of all a reasonable standard for everybody. Indeed I quite agree with an outstanding American economist who states that "the only life worth living is that in which one's cherished wants are few, simple, and noble." We have room on the land of the United States for a great number of families who are content with such a standard.

Perhaps I do not see the full implications of Mr. Rohwer's remark about Ghandi's philosophy. But I trust that so long as we continue to speak of Yankee ingenuity we will not have to take our problems to Ghandi and his India for a solution.

EDGAR SCHMIEDELER.

Catholic University of America.

FARM-URBAN CONFLICT IN THE VILLAGE

Professor Smith's article in the March 1942 *RURAL SOCIOLOGY*, "The Role of the Village in American Rural Society," concludes with the significant summary statement, "The village constitutes the line of contact and frequently the line of scrimmage between the rural and urban cultures or worlds." It is Professor Smith's belief, indicated in the main body of the article (p. 21) ". . . that these differences (between rural and urban attitudes) must ultimately be resolved. Men cannot fight all the time."

The writer holds the opinion, based on a study of farm-nonfarm village contacts which he has been carrying on for some time, that the above-mentioned differences will never be resolved—as long as farming is an occupation of family units. Certain substances in nature "fight" whenever they are brought into contact. Men, it is to be presumed, will do the same whenever in their association they are made conscious of the fact that they are living in accordance with conflicting values. Personal characteristics are influential in determining the form and the degree of severity of the conflict engendered through association. In many cases, farmers and urban-natured village residents carry on their dealings most agreeably with one another. This, however, does not at all mean that their differences have been resolved. They are men of diverse cultures, living in harmony with contradictory worlds of value.

Certain writers hold the opinion that the differences between farmers and others are quite superficial in character, of a kind to melt away after the two sorts of people have been quite closely associated for some time. It may be, however, that the differences are so fundamental that increasingly close contact will serve rather to accentuate them than otherwise. It is the writer's contention that such is the case.

There would seem to be no more fundamental element in a people's culture than the nature of the relation of the family to

its individual members. The way a husband regards his wife and the attitude of parents toward their children are very basic matters in any people's way of life. In respect to these matters farmers and others are bound to differ as long as farming is carried on by families. And as long as farmers and those villagers who live according to urban values differ so definitely as to something of so great importance there can be no blending of their cultures.

Urban life, in general, is an organization of individuals. Because of this, urban parents, within the limits of their knowledge and financial ability, will do the best they can for their young children as persons in the hope that they may be successful in the personal adjustments they will later make in adult life. Because of this also, urban women are increasingly demanding that the marriages they make shall be of a sort not to interfere with their individual development and expression as persons. On the other hand, "good" farm wives and children are known to be such by the apparent ease with which they subordinate conflicting personal inclinations in the face of family necessity as interpreted by the family head.

As long as these things are so, a feeling of unlikeness is bound to exist between farmers and others when they come into contact in the village. People of any culture who are truly loyal to it feel that their way of life is normal and right, and that those who hold other values are to some extent an inferior folk. It is but to be expected that those with urban ideals will ridicule or pity the farm individual because of his lack of personal freedom. It should be no more cause for surprise that thoroughgoing family-farm people should feel that the women and children of the towns suffer from insufficient family restraint.

A people's way of life determines its values. Farmers and urbanized villagers have of necessity such unlike ways of life that there cannot be for them any true

community of feeling. In other words, the American village-centered community is pretty much a *Gesellschaft* sort of thing, and must remain such as long as agricul-

ture continues to be an occupation of family-farm units.

ROY H. HOLMES.

University of Michigan.

CURRENT BULLETIN REVIEWS

*Edited by Conrad Taeuber**

RURAL YOUTH STUDIES

Matching Youth and Jobs. By Howard M. Bell. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. 274. \$2.00.

Youth, Family, and Education. By Joseph K. Folsom. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. 299. \$1.75.

Youth Work Programs: Problems and Policies. By Lewis L. Lorwin. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. 195. \$1.75.

Time on Their Hands: A Report on Leisure, Recreation, and Young People. By Gilbert C. Wrenn and D. L. Harley. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. 266. \$2.00.

Work Camps for High School Youth. By Kenneth Holland and George L. Bickel. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. 27.

The Community and Its Young People. By Merritt M. Chambers. Washington, D. C.: American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. 36.

Iowa's Rural Youth and the National Defense Program. Ames: Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State College, Pamphlet 14, 1941. Pp. 4.

* Assisted by Elsie S. Manny, Jane Wooley, William DeHart, and Josiah C. Folsom.

Older Rural Youth in Minnesota. By Ruby Christenson. St. Paul: Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, Pamphlet 78, 1941. Pp. 21.

Rural Youth in LaPorte County, Indiana. By Harry F. Ainsworth and Others. Lafayette: Purdue University in cooperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, 1941. Pp. 37.

The Rural Youth of Ross County, Ohio. Columbus: Ohio State University, Department of Rural Economics and Rural Sociology and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture cooperating. Bulletin Numbers 140, 141, 142, 1941. Pp. 112.

Youth, California's Future. A Summary of the Findings of the California Youth Survey. By Claudia Williams and Others. Sacramento: Department of Education and the State Relief Administration, 1940. Pp. 72.

Youth Adjustments in a Rural Culture. (Rockville Community, Hanover County, Virginia.) By Dorothy G. Jones. Blacksburg: Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Rural Sociology Report Number 16, 1941. Pp. 66.

Out of School Young Men on Farms. By H. M. Byram. Lansing: Michigan State Board of Control for Vocational Education, 1941. Bulletin 274. Pp. 47.

These studies are being grouped into two

sections for purposes of review. The first seven deal with various aspects of youth action programs, some covering action from a general or community point of view and others emphasizing some specific phase of youth problems with action analysis and recommendations. The remainder are field studies of youth dealing with the problem of finding the actual status of young people in specific community situations.

The first four studies listed have been sponsored by the American Youth Commission and deal with the four youth problem areas of job placement, family life education, youth work programs, and recreation. *Bell* stresses the importance of systematic action in a field which has taken on a tremendously added significance even since the beginning of the war, namely that of getting the right man and the right job together. The study is based on the operation of experimental youth placement services in several selected cities. The three main points of emphasis are (1) the need for coordinating research with action, (2) the need for a local community approach, and (3) the need for a coordination of agency efforts on the local and non-local community levels. Here again the Youth Commission has shown the advantage which a neutral action agency has in bringing about agency coordination. *Lorwin* analyzes the administration of Federal youth work programs and deals with such topics as basic concepts and objectives, who should work, what kinds of work should be done, wages, public relations including those with labor unions, costs, and administration. He concludes with recommendations for an expanded and improved Federal youth program. These studies are necessary reading for those who are interested in this important field of youth and jobs, but they do seem to over-emphasize the employment aspects of youth problems and minimize the importance of others.

Folsom has prepared a readable review of the problems of modern family life, the changing status and objectives of education, and the relations between the social scientist and the educator. The volume presents the case for a widely expanded program of

family life education, stressing its increasing importance in a modern world of confusion. It is significant because it brings the findings of the more specialized fields of study to people who need to understand these principles, but who do not take the time to read the volumes from which the data are taken. The second part of the study presents a summary of developments in this field during recent years.

Wrenn and *Harley* have prepared an excellent summarization of objectives, needs, action programs, and recommendations concerning recreation. The basic opinions of the authors are well represented by the following statement found on page 247, "recreation must be accepted as a major youth need, paralleling education and employment in importance, a necessity in a democracy and vital to adequate planning for national security."

These and other volumes dealing with youth action programs are based on facts and opinions which indicate that all is not well with the functioning of the traditional process through which youth are inducted into our culture. They suggest programs which will assist the young people passing through this process. In general, they have emphasized the most significant phases of the problems of youth and stress the need for action.

Holland and *Bickel* state the problem of the need for modern young people to obtain experience in performing manual labor and describe recent experiences in work camps for high school youth. In these the emphasis is upon doing physical work of a service nature without pay. It is interesting to note how these young people seem vitally interested in obtaining this kind of experience. *Chambers* encourages young people to get together and help build better communities, insisting that youth programs should get into the real problems of community living. Although tending to under-emphasize the tremendous implications of following out the suggestions, the booklet recommends local youth initiative in solving the problems of education, health, recreation, local government, and agency coordination. *Iowa's Rural Youth and the Na-*

tional Defense Program is one of the best jobs of dissemination in all of the many recent youth publications. It uses basic data collected without elaborate field studies, but is aimed for a large reading audience and is a cleverly done piece of work with a good picture front page. It presents first, "the situation," and then "what we can do" for the four subjects of jobs, education, recreation, and democracy. It demonstrates that facts can be made interesting and, when compared to the other youth studies, shows that dissemination is one of the major problems of fact finding programs.

The field studies have collected an astounding array of facts about youth. The methodology of the Ohio and Indiana surveys has been significant because the young people of the county youth groups have done the actual job of contacting the youth and obtaining the information for the schedules. This technique is an important development in the direction of combining research and action in the youth field.

All of these studies stress several important aspects of the much broader problem of youth becoming integrated into our culture. Problems in the specific areas of making a living, getting an education, having fun, living in families, living in communities, and participating in democratic living have been developing for several decades, but have been recognized widely only since 1930. At these observable points, many studies have been made and extensive recommendations and action programs sponsored, but still the problems continue to exist. The recent plentiful supply of jobs has alleviated one or two of these areas, but has created many other problem situations such as confusion in getting man and job together, mass housing, and inadequate recreation.

These studies indicate certain aspects of problems, but there has been little analysis of the underlying factors. In order to comprehend the specific problems mentioned above, we need to know more about this socialization process through which youth pass in developing from childhood into anticipated and approved adult behavior. As specific phases of this process are under-

stood better, then planners should be in a more adequate position to assist in building adjustment programs. It will be possible also to understand the adjustments in the general economic and social structure which will be necessary in order that youth may have a more significant participation in the various important aspects of the culture. The need for understanding is high-lighted today when the democratic peoples are fighting a situation which developed out from a youth revolt against adult social and economic entrenchment.

We need to know more about the specific steps in this socialization process which has developed in a primary rural culture and which is failing to function in present society either as it did formerly or as anticipated by most people. How do personalities develop in different family, community, and class environments, for instance? The attention of scientific investigators needs to be turned now to the broader and deeper aspects of this process in order that we will be able to understand the phases which are seen easily by mere surface observation. As this is analyzed further in the light of our cultural values, then action recommendations and planning can be done in a more systematic manner. The above studies are significant, but really have just led up to the investigation of the real problem. They have made a credible beginning by furnishing basic data which is necessary as a starting point.

The problem is of such extreme importance that it affects the very stability of our social structure. Fundamental solutions need to be discovered. These may mean drastic changes in our social organization and such aspects as the rights of adults and property owners may have to be altered to meet new situations. However, if sociologists are to accept the present values desiring social stability, then it becomes their job as scientists to find a means of achieving these values. The ends are set, the job of the scientist is to find the means.

CHRISTOPHER SOWER.

Ohio State University.

POPULATION

For purposes of presentation the State¹ is divided into 10 social subregions, and trends are shown for each and for the separate counties in each, from 1860-1940. The most rapid and consistent growth has been in the Cumberland Plateau, which grew more rapidly than any other subregion throughout the period. In 1860 it was in sixth place with respect to number of people, but in 1940 it had more people than any other subregion. Although this was an area of out migration during a part of the time, its rate of growth was equal to that of the United States as a whole throughout the period when immigrants were coming in large numbers. Trends in growth in the counties in this subregion were uniform until 1910. From then until 1930, the incoming counties grew most rapidly; but between 1930 and 1940, every county in this subregion increased its population. "The circumstances affecting general stability after 1900 in most other subregions of Kentucky were conspicuously not operative in the mountains. There is no evidence that the accumulation of population in this area would cease after 1940 unless employment opportunities outside the subregion were to become effective agents of emigration."

*New settlement problems in the Northeastern Louisiana Delta*² is an account of the recent movement of farmers into three Louisiana parishes of the Cut-over region of the Mississippi Delta. Fifteen hundred families moved to the new lands of these parishes in the past 10 years. A number of conditions made effective land utilization difficult for the majority of new farmers, chiefly the need of an adequate drainage system and the nature of the purchase contracts for land. On the average between \$25 and \$40 was paid per acre with terms of approximately 10 years to complete the pay-

ments. In addition to the many expenses of establishing a home, the farmer had to clear his property, buy implements, and meet other economic obligations. After 3 years when payments, with interest, on the farm were due, the farmer was usually in no position to fulfill his contract. For economic reasons many settlers have had to give up their holdings, gaining nothing for the improvements which they had made on their farms. Most of the settlers in the region had incurred debts, for which many were paying a high rate of interest. Only about one-half of the farmers were profiting by the cheaper interest rates made on loans through the Farm Security Administration. In the main, the farmers concentrated on raising cotton. It would have been more advisable, the authors asserted, for the farmers to raise a variety of farm products and become more self-sufficient as a farming unit.

The authors state that 90 percent of this land can be successfully drained. By combining smaller districts into a larger unit a system of drainage could be worked out with a maximum of economy to the farmer. Costs of land should be reduced and longer terms for payments stipulated in the contracts. Certain changes were also suggested and new policies advised in reference to the adaptation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration cotton program and Farm Security Administration program to the current and specific settlement problems of this area.

*Rural population in New York State*³ has increased during the past two decades. Although the rural farm population increased between 1930 and 1940, there was a decrease in the number of farms and also in the amount of land used for farming purposes. The counties including the largest population centers and those nearest to New York City received the greatest number of migrants to the rural areas. The suburban counties near New York City and the 10

¹Howard W. Beers. *Growth of Population in Kentucky 1860-1940*. Ky. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 422. 24 pp. Lexington, April 1942.

²Philip E. Jones and others. *New settlement problems in the Northeastern Louisiana Delta*. La. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 335. 47 pp. In cooperation with Bur. Agr. Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. University, Feb., 1942.

³W. A. Anderson. *Rural population in New York State—1940*. Mimeo. Bul. No. 5, 13 pp. Cornell Univ. Agr. Expt. Sta. Ithaca, May, 1942.

counties with the 10 next largest cities had the greatest rural increase, principally in the open-country nonfarm and unincorporated village population. "The increase in rural farm population of New York State, therefore, is not to be accounted for altogether by an increase in persons engaged in farming as an occupation, but largely by 'spilling over' of suburban dwellers onto farms and the 'damming up' of the local population on them." The tendency of farmers to remain in rural areas when changing from farm to industrial employment, and the movement of city-employed persons to small villages and farms, produces many social and economic problems of important consequence to the farmer. There follows also a rapid transformation of farm life where distinctions of rural and urban culture are becoming only a matter of occupational differences.

*War and migration of rural youth*⁴ follows an earlier study of rural youth in Ross County, Ohio. From the 1,602 youths studied in 1940, a representative sample of 560 were selected in March, 1942. Through personal interviews with the young people or with relatives and friends, data showing present residence and occupation were obtained. There was an extensive migration of rural young people from farms and villages. Nearly one-half of the 18-27 year olds when the survey was first taken had moved from the county. About one-half of the men had gone to cities.

Forty percent of those who left entered the armed forces, while the others turned principally to non-agricultural employment in nearby industrial centers. Fewer women (38.2 percent) left their rural homes. More persons left the villages than farms. Migration away from the farms and villages proved to be positively correlated with education and level-of-living and negatively correlated with age and the number of years married.

*Sons from rural families in South Dakota*⁵

⁴A. R. Mangus and Christopher E. Sower. *War and migration of rural youth. A study of Ross County, Ohio.* Ohio Univ. Mimeo. Bul. 149. 9 pp. Columbus, June, 1942.

since 1935 have been entering non-agricultural occupations in larger proportions than those who left before 1935. Forty percent of the migrants who left in 1941 joined the armed forces; skilled and unskilled workers and other non-agricultural occupations account for nearly all of the remainder. Agriculture was the occupation of less than 5 percent of these recent migrants, although nearly 50 percent of the migrants who left home before 1935 were engaged in farming. The opening up of more non-agricultural employment opportunities has involved a greater range of migration. In 1935, one-half of the sons who had left home were still in the home county; altogether three-fourths were still in the home State. In 1941, however, only one-fourth of the sons who had left home after 1935 were still in the home county and the proportion still in the home State was less than three-fifths. Daughters who recently left home also moved farther than those who had gone before 1935. Three out of 10 of the migrants out of the State went to California. This report is based on a follow-up in 5 counties in which a rural migration survey was made in 1935.

The report on *the Riner community an area of population flow*⁶ results from an analysis of census schedules, local records and a minimum of field work. Less than one-fourth of the families present in the district in 1930 were there or represented by a male ancestor in 1870. Of the 615 heads of white families in 1930 only 291 were there in 1910 or had any male forbear there then. Only 246 family lines were present in 1900 and 144 in 1870. Of the 168 families who came into the district between the 1900 and 1910 censuses, less than one-third remained in 1930. Of 354 sons under 10 reported in 1900 only one-sixth were still

⁵Walter L. Slocum. *Migrants from rural South Dakota families. Their geographical and occupational distribution.* S. Dak. Agr. Expt. Sat. Bul. 359. 20 pp. Brookings, April, 1942.

⁶Charles G. Burr and Louis E. Moseley. *The Riner community an area of population flow.* Rur. Socio. Rpt. No. 21. 24 pp. Va. Agr. Expt. Sta. in cooperation with WPA. Blacksburg, May, 1942.

in the district 30 years later. The owners of the larger farms represented a high degree of residential stability. The difference in birth rates between upper and lower economic groups was much more marked in 1930 than in 1870, in the latter year the fertility ratio of the upper group was only one-third as great as that of the lower group. The effects of the flow of population through the area upon community life are traced.

FARM LABOR

*Men and machines in the North Dakota harvest,*⁷ a study of the North Dakota small grain harvest of 1938, had two objectives: to determine (1) the effect of harvest practices and equipment upon labor requirements, and (2) the characteristics and experiences of harvest laborers, particularly transients. A finding of salient interest in this wartime labor stringency is that the State's own labor supply in 1938 would have been more than ample to care for the crop if there had been a 50 percent efficiency in its distribution, and if operations had been somewhat prolonged with smaller crews to take advantage of the available season for respective operations. Labor supply, demand, and information services lacked much in centralization in practice, even though the then North Dakota Employment Service was working toward it; its federal successor, the U. S. Employment Service for North Dakota is nearer that goal today.

The report punctures, as did Don D. Lescohier 20 years ago, the popular belief that a force of migratory laborers starts in the Southern Great Plains and works northward with the harvest. Actually, successive waves of laborers take up and pass on the task; fewer than one-third of transient harvest laborers in North Dakota in 1938 had worked in the harvest elsewhere. The com-

bine, introduced in the Plains since Lescohier's investigation, has greatly reduced, but not entirely eliminated, the need for outside labor in the wheat belt.

Migrant laborers in the harvest were nearly all young, native-born whites; half were under 25 years of age. Most of them came to the harvest because of economic necessity, but few earned more than expenses of travel and living between jobs. Many of the harvest laborers, both migrant and local, told of social and economic problems which they were unable to solve without help. State and federal action seemed necessary to assure these laborers their fundamental rights, privileges, and responsibilities as American citizens. Even with the present changed economic conditions this is probably measurably true.

*Backgrounds of the war farm labor problem*⁸ was intended to assemble in one place the most important facts about the highly varied conditions of farm employment. Drawing on a multitude of specialized and isolated studies in the field, it describes the varied effects of technology, lost markets, trends in farm population, the agricultural ladder, and the relations of industrial employment and farm income upon problems of farm labor. Recommendations for action include: regulation of wages, stabilization of employment; legal protection of economic, civil and political rights; public assistance programs; special programs for agricultural workers; and expansion of industrial opportunities in post-war planning. The descriptive section includes an account of the numbers and distribution of farm laborers, their characteristics, and the special problems of such groups as women and child workers, sharecroppers, the hired man and migratory agricultural workers. Earnings and incomes, causes of inadequate employment, wage payments and collections, housing, food and subsistence, and health are described. The final sections deal with the organization of the farm labor market, methods of supervision, collective bargain-

⁷Robert M. Cullen, Josiah C. Folsom, and Donald G. Hay. *Men and machines in the North Dakota harvest*. 62 pp. Bur. Agr. Econ. in cooperation with Farm Security Adm., U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington, D. C. April, 1942.

⁸U. S. Dept. Agr. Bur. Agr. Econ. and Farm Sec. Admin. *Backgrounds of the war farm labor problem*. 183 pp. Washington, D. C. May, 1942.

ing, and the major forms of legislative protection available to farm laborers as well as the types of protection available to other workers which do not include farm laborers. In the latter sections some descriptions of European experience are included. Although planned and largely executed before the beginning of the war, this report is timely now, for as the authors point out: "Not only is there a very real and tangible connection between what happened in the field of farm labor a few years ago and what is happening today, but also it is impossible to solve adequately the pressing problems of today without looking beneath the surface for main causes."

FARM TENURE

The families interviewed for this study⁹ were grouped in relation to security of tenure and degree of control over management. Only 11 percent of the farm operators were debt-free full owners—nearly half were part or full owners with mortgaged land or tenants whose chattels were mortgaged. The families with the greatest degree of security of tenure and control took better care of their property as reflected in care of machinery, they also reported the highest proportion of church membership, they more frequently than others had a hired man. One-third of them had inherited their farms. When the entire group was asked how ownership should be attained, nearly three-fourths recommended assistance from relatives. Government assistance was recommended by less than one-fifth, but was generally favored for cases in which relatives could not help.

*Farm tenure in South Dakota*¹⁰ outlines trends in land tenure in South Dakota for the past 30 years and gives a detailed study of facts obtained from the 1940 census. Characteristics of full owners, part owners and tenants, as well as differences in the

farms operated, are presented, with the aid of many charts and tables. The percentage of tenancy in South Dakota has continued upwards in spite of the improvement in agricultural conditions along with a concerted effort to deal with farm tenure problems. Fifty-three percent of all the farm operators in the State were tenants in 1940; in 1910, only 25 percent were tenants. Part of the recent increase is due to use of land which was idle in 1935. Increased leasing has been encouraged by the AAA payments for soil conservation practices on range land. Decreases in tenancy in certain counties is not the result of former tenants becoming owners, but is due to a greater migration of tenants than owners from the area. Electrification and mechanization are discussed, and some attention is given to the problems resulting from the high average age of machinery. The social effects of residential instability and absenteeism are indicated.

LEVELS OF LIVING

To provide the Farm Security Administration with information for planning its program, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was requested to furnish for various sections of the country farm plans which would specifically indicate the size and type of farm organization necessary to permit paying for a farm, maintaining the farm plant, and providing the family with a satisfactory level of living.¹¹ To allow for the wide regional variations which exist in respect to types of farming, and the regional and cultural elements in levels of living, the studies were made in five areas: the lower Piedmont of Georgia and South Carolina; the Delta of Mississippi, Louisiana and Arkansas; Southeastern Colorado and Northeastern New Mexico; North Central South Dakota; and South Central Minnesota. The minimum acceptable standard of living was established from a series of studies which had been made in each area.

⁹Walter L. Slocum. *The influence of tenure status upon rural life*. S. Dak. Agr. Expt. Sta. Cir. 39. 20 pp. Brookings, May, 1942.

¹⁰Alvin E. Coons and Walter L. Slocum. *Farm tenure in South Dakota*. S. Dak. Agr. Expt. Sta. Mimeo. Pamphlet No. 1, 24 pp. Brookings, Jan., 1942.

¹¹George T. Schaefer and others. *Farm resources and farming systems needed to meet living needs of farm families*. 48 pp. Part VI South Central Minnesota. Bur. Agr. Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr., Milwaukee, May, 1942.

In South Central Minnesota field survey to determine the extent to which families were satisfied with their levels of living was also used to assist in determining the minimum level of living to be recommended for the area. Farm plans were then developed around the minimum acceptable level of living on the assumption that family size farms were desired.

MISCELLANEOUS

*For a better post-war agriculture*¹² is the subject of Planning Pamphlets No. 11 of the National Planning Association. The foreword states: "We are fighting, in part, for freedom from want. To attain that freedom means new responsibilities for our farm peoples, because it is their labor that produces many of our necessities. It means a more efficient use of our agricultural resources in order for that labor not to be in vain. It means, also, extending that freedom to millions of our farm families who live in want for lack of the opportunity to produce and to share in the fruits of their labor." After raising questions of the kind of farms and the number of farms the Nation wants, the pamphlet discusses better working conditions, care of the land, range lands, the use of forests, better homes, and improving rural living.

A review of *selling and buying cooperatively by farmers*¹³ prepared in the Farm Credit Administration concludes that farmer cooperation is likely to continue its upward climb not only in the fields of selling and buying, but also as regards the farmer's efforts to supply himself with essential services. This conclusion is based on Agricultural Census Data for 1919, 1924, 1929, and 1939. Selling cooperatives concerned chiefly with assembling, processing, and forwarding farm produce to market, received special attention in the first decade of the present century. Early in the 1920's, a cam-

paign in behalf of large-scale, centralized, single-commodity cooperatives was started. Buying cooperatives increased in the second half of the 1920's, while farmers' cooperative purchasing of services such as mutual insurance, electric current, telephone, and transportation was not in evidence in any appreciable amount until 1930.

The writer points out that cooperation is primarily a state of mind and determines the attitude of the individual toward his neighbor, fellow worker, and social group. It is more often the result of slow growth rather than of emotional conversion. Where the cooperative attitude has been developing among people for many decades, such as Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, there is also to be found the highest percentage of cooperators.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- Bercaw, Louise O. *Farm tenancy in the United States, 1940-1941*. A selected list of references. Library List No. 2. 49 pp. Supplements Agr. Econ. Bibliog. No. 85, *Farm tenancy in the United States, 1937-1939*. U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington, D. C. May 1942.
- Bonser, H. J. and others. *Quarter century of agricultural changes in southwestern Knox County, Tennessee*. Rur. Res. Ser. Mono. 135. 71 pp. Tenn. Agr. Expt. Sta. Knoxville, April 10, 1942.
- Borg, Walter T. *War and agriculture in the United States, 1914-1941*. Selected references. Agr. Econ. Bibliog. 93. 43 pp. Bur. Agr. Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington, D. C. Jan. 1942.
- Brady, Dorothy S. and others. *Changes in assets and liabilities of families*. Urban, Village, Farm. Misc. Pub. 464. 226 pp. Bur. Home Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. in cooperation with WPA. Washington, D. C. 1941.
- Brady, Dorothy S. and others. *Family income and expenditures*. Southeast Region Part I Farm Series. Misc. Pub. 462. 208 pp. Bur. Home Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. in cooperation with WPA. Washington, D. C. 1941.
- Conover, Helen F. *The Netherlands East Indies. A selected list of references*. 46 pp.

¹²National Planning Association. *For a better post-war agriculture*. Planning Pamphlets No. 11. 47 pp. Washington, D. C., May, 1942.

¹³R. H. Elsworth. *Selling and buying cooperatively by farmers*. Misc. Report 43. 17 pp. Farm Credit Adm. U. S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D. C., Dec., 1941.

- Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. April 2, 1942.
- Elsworth, R. H. and Wanstall, Grace. *Statistics of farmers' marketing and purchasing cooperatives 1940-1941 marketing season*. Misc. Report No. 50. 33 pp. Farm Credit Adm., U. S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D. C. Feb. 1942.
- Fuller, Grace Hadley. *Australia—A selected list of references*. 101 pp. Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. April 2, 1942.
- Griffith, Donald T. *Land utilization and settlement opportunities in Kootenai County, Idaho*. 51 pp. Bur. Agr. Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. Berkeley, June 1942.
- John, M. E. *Part-time farming in Pennsylvania*. State Col. Ext. Cir. 229. 8 pp. State College, 1941.
- John, M. E. and others. *Poorly-housed rural families of two Pennsylvania Townships*. Pa. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 417. 26 pp. State College, Nov. 1941.
- Moffett, M'Ledge. *Youth looks at marriage*. 48 pp. Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York, 1942.
- Monroe, Day and others. *Family expenditures for personal care, gifts, selected taxes and miscellaneous items*. Five Regions. Urban, Village, Farm. Misc. Pub. 455. 113 pp. Bur. Home Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. in cooperation with WPA. Washington, D. C. 1941.
- Monroe, Day and others. *Family income and expenditures*. Five Regions Part 2. Farm Series. Misc. Pub. 465. 366 pp. Bur. Home Econ., U. S. Dept. Agr. in cooperation with WPA. Washington, D. C. 1941.
- Poffenberger, P. R. and others. *Farmers' mutual fire insurance in Maryland*. Md. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. A5. Pp. 123-144. College Park, 1941.
- Tetreau, E. D. *Arizona farm leases*. Ariz. Agr. Expt. Sta. Bul. 179. Pp. 391-407. Tucson, Feb. 1942.
- The Philadelphia Child Health Society. *Family nutrition*. 106 pp. Philadelphia, April 1942.
- U. S. Congress—Senate—77th Congress. *Report of the committee on education and labor*. Report No. 1150, Part 3. Employers' Associations and collective bargaining in California. The disadvantaged status of unorganized labor in California's industrialized agriculture. Washington, D. C. June 1942.
- U. S. Dept. Agr., Bur. Ag. Econ. in cooperation with Ext. Service. *Organization of groups for discussion and action*. 13 pp. Washington, D. C., April 1942.
- U. S. Dept. Com., Bur. of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. *Small town manual*. 78 pp. Part I: How you can win the war at home. Part II: How you can improve business in your town. Washington, D. C. 1942.
- Wagley, Charles. *Economics of a Guatemalan village*. 85 pp. The American Anthropological Association. Menasha, Wis. 1941.
- Whiting, Theodore E. and Woofter, T. J., Jr. *Summary of relief and federal work program statistics 1933-1940*. 64 pp. Divisions of Statistics and Research, WPA. Washington, D. C. 1941.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by Reed H. Bradford

Parity, Parity, Parity. By John D. Black. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Committee on Research in Social Sciences, 1942. Pp. xi + 376.

Few contemporary slogans have greater political appeal than *parity*. It has provided the farmers with a powerful objective in their struggle for recognition of the problems of agriculture and in their bargain for a greater share of the Nation's income. The function of parity, however, is not merely that of a catchword attracting the support of farmer groups and a powerful congressional bloc for agricultural legislation and relief measures. "Parity for agriculture" carries the motivating force of an element in a doctrine of social morals. Since "parity" was first introduced to the public in the early postwar proposals for farm relief, it has been repeated endlessly in farm meetings, in the lobbies of congress and in the debates of the House and Senate. It has been written into numerous congressional bills and acts and it occupies a prominent place in all discussions and literature dealing with the farm problem.

In this process "parity for agriculture" has become very popular and is today sanctified as a celestial justification of any demands for a better deal to agriculture. Typically enough its real meaning has largely been forgotten and is seldom questioned. Any attempts to raise farm prices can now be motivated by a reference to the parity objective. This is, of course, an appeal to emotional sentiments and not to reason. Moreover there is in this an acute danger for the proper functioning of the democratic process in policy making. The real issue behind the pressure for a more favorable farm legislation is obscured, when the objective is stated in terms of parity. It will thus be difficult and often impossible to achieve a compromise between the various interest groups in society with respect to goals for agricultural policy.

Consequently these goals are determined by the temporary strength of certain pressure groups in bargaining that resembles horse trade rather than a continuous process through which responsible leaders for social groups try to reach an understanding of their various objectives as a basis of intelligent planning for the common welfare.

In investigating parity in its various aspects, J. D. Black in his recent book *Parity, Parity, Parity* has performed a great public service. He has exposed this anomalous concept to a penetrating analysis against the background of recent economic developments. To constitute a sensible goal for agricultural policy, parity, according to Black, must imply a way of distributing the national income between agriculture, labor and capital. The farmers, in their discontent with existing economic conditions, have claimed the right to a larger share of the national income. In demanding parity they contend that the present situation could and indeed should be remedied by re-establishment of the balance that prevailed during the period 1910-1914. This period was one of relatively high return to agriculture and low return to labor, as is borne out by a statistical comparison between agriculture and industry of real incomes, industrial wages and prices since the Civil War. The author, therefore concludes that the selection of this base period places agriculture at a relative advantage over labor and capital. Most other historic periods would be less favorable to agriculture.

Since 1910-14 there have been many and substantial variations in the division of the national income among these three components. For the period as a whole, all three partakers have gained with the increase of total real income, labor most and agriculture least. That the share of agriculture has been reduced is, of course, a normal phenomenon in a progressive economy. In-

creasing social income means simply that relatively more is spent on industrial goods and less on farm products. If population trends, and especially the changes in the number of "gainful workers" are taken into account, agriculture does not seem to have lost out. After the rise in farm prices in the last year or two, per capita income has been brought to approximately the same level above 1910-14 in agriculture as elsewhere. Inequality of income between agriculture and industry existed already during the base period and therefore has nothing to do with parity.

Parity as a device for division of the national income is, however, only one of many possible interpretations. It might be the most plausible definition but it is by no means the most popular one. Farmers within and without Congress have never stopped to think of parity as a ratio of prices on farm and non-farm products. In the present situation very little is actually heard of income parity. What the farm bloc demands is not higher income but, instead, higher prices.

It is revealed in this book that parity, as a price balance, is an irrational concept. This aspect could have been given more emphasis. After all, in spite of many efforts, it has not been and can never be proved that 1910-14 prices were in equilibrium, balancing consumption and production, individual purchases, entrepreneurial outlays and costs of production, providing a proper use of human and physical resources and equitable standards of living for all groups in society. In any case it is absurd to assume that a certain price ratio existing a generation ago would have the same significance today in terms of income distribution and allocation of resources.

That parity is not the ultimate goal for agricultural policy but a rationalization of demands for higher farm prices is further illustrated by recent attempts to shift the base period and the weights used in the construction of the parity index. According to the original index, farm prices reached and surpassed parity in the latter part of 1941. Since then the farm bloc, the Farm

Bureau and the Grange have urged that new items be included in the index, the weights be changed and the base period shifted. This is done to get a new parity concept that would motivate further price increases.

On top of all this it has been suggested also that farm prices be allowed to rise to 110 per cent of parity. It is pointed out in the book that everybody interested in a maximum war effort and successful postwar planning should oppose these juggleries by groups and individuals that put their own immediate interest before the welfare of the Nation. Already attempts to control the impending inflation have been seriously hampered. The situation, therefore, is grave.

The author by no means overlooks the responsibility of labor for the threat of inflation. The arguments against further increases in farm prices are repeated against the suggestions to raise wage rates. Labor, according to Black, has been more than compensated for the lag in income that existed in the second decade of the century. Furthermore, wage increases in the present emergency have gone beyond what the author considers safe for the balance of the economy. Of the three partakers of the national income, capital has received since 1939 the smallest increase in return per unit of volume used in the production process. On this point the author might have stretched the conclusions further than the statistical material warrants. The picture might be slightly different if we take into account the fact that salaries to executive officers in industry should be referred to in many cases as return on capital and not as labor income. Salaries to business executives seem to have increased more than the wage rates of unskilled workers, who constitute the majority of the labor force.

Although Black admits that farmers gain from increased industrial employment, nevertheless he states that agriculture does not benefit from increases of industrial wages. This is debatable. If prices farmers pay rise more than prices farmers receive, agriculture will of course lose from increased wage rates. However, there is at

least a possibility that changes in wage rates may not affect the general price level. According to Alvin Hansen and before him, to the Stockholm School of Economics, changes in wage rates in the past have not been responsible for the cyclical movements of the price level. In most instances increases in wage rates have been made with reference to profit gains already available. If prices in general are not affected, an industrial wage increase would mean simply a redistribution of income in favor of the lower income groups. In this case, as income elasticity of demand for food and clothing is greater in the lower than in the upper income strata, agriculture would benefit from increased industrial wages.

Black is not content with merely playing the role of an elegant and merciless critic of "parity policies." He presents also a positive program for the future of agriculture as a part of an over-all plan for industrial expansion. Some outstanding elements of this program are:

1. Agricultural prices should be fixed. But they should be allowed to reach a level necessary only to bring about a volume of farm products sufficient to meet market demand and the needs of those whose consumption is subsidized by marketing programs. This means that price pegging should be abolished as a means of improving the income of the farm production. Instead, ways of reducing costs of production should be found and migration from farms to urban occupations stimulated.

2. Costs of production should be reduced through subsidies and loans for mechanization and for shifts in farming practices.

3. The surplus population in agriculture should be given employment in industry.

4. Surplus stocks of good years should be carried over into years of crop failure.

5. Stamp plans and school lunches should be continued and expanded.

6. Operators of submarginal farms who cannot migrate to urban industries should be helped by means of relief measures similar to those now in operation through the FSA.

This list is, of course, incomplete. It sug-

gests, nevertheless, that the positive sections of Black's latest book are fascinating and worthy a scientist of his vision. As a whole, *Parity, Parity, Parity* constitutes by far the most important contribution to the contemporary discussion of agricultural policy.

GUNNAR LANGE.

North Carolina State College.

Ill Fares the Land. By Carey McWilliams. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1942. Pp. 419. \$3.00.

The title of this book will be recognized as coming from Oliver Goldsmith's poem, "The Deserted Village." The context of the clause "ill fares the land" is reproduced on the title page. The purpose of the book as stated by the author in his Introduction is "to sharpen our perception of . . . the shifting shadows that mark the movement of migrants across the land." Readers should note by the sub-title on the title page that "migrants and migratory labor in the United States" are discussed. Readers should also note the colorful, sometimes flamboyant, chapter headings. These prepare one for a journalistic swing across the United States, in the course of which "the shifting shadows mark the movement of migrants across the land."

Frequent use of unreliable statistical data mars the book as journalism. Drawing copiously from sources that are not authoritative as well as from those that are more dependable, the author builds up his case, many of the points of which would stand out more strongly were they set forth as simple unadorned arguments. When statements which in themselves seem reasonable are buttressed by information which is known or strongly suspected to be unreliable, the whole structure is weakened.

A 20-page bibliography is included and contains numerous titles from popular periodicals as well as research publications.

Now as to the outcomes. Apparently the way out lies in the direction of a farmer-labor alliance. Farm workers and dirt farmers should organize, thus more effectively joining hands with organized industrial la-

bor. A "solution," however, must wait "until the masses of the people actually get possession of the reins of power, both economic and political." Until then "they will not be able to create a democratic non-exploitative economic order." There is nothing unfamiliar about these proposals to the student of economic thought and of agrarian movements. Certain European ideologists and American Alliance leaders in the 1890's come to mind.

The reviewer wishes to say that recent and current domestic events have a particular bearing upon this kind of "solution." The transfer of *power* into the hands of labor does not necessarily decrease, much less terminate, autocratic exploitative activity in our economic order.

Perhaps there is still some place for those painstaking workers in industry and agriculture, in science and in engineering, who hold that "solutions" are, after all, rarely if ever to be found. The choice lies between intelligent adjustment to changing conditions in a thousand ways, or surrender to some system or group which will take things over in its own way and for its own ends. There can be no uncertainty for the social scientist as to the course he will choose to take.

It must be said that the book serves the useful purpose of jarring the reader out of his assumption of local community superiority, for the sweep of the author's picture covers every part of the United States. He urges that we "refashion this economic order," failing which, he says, "the shadows are likely to lengthen across the land."

E. D. TETREAU.

University of Arizona.

Forward to the Land. By Elmer T. Peterson. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1942. Pp. xvi + 283. \$2.75

Farm for Fortune and Vice Versa. By Ladd Haystead. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1942. Pp. xiii + 207. \$2.00.

Cities are especially vulnerable in modern war, and everybody knows it. We wonder if anyone would dare guess what proportion of the people now living in the metropolitan areas of Europe, where bombs have fallen

or may fall, would like to move out to some solitary farm homestead. Now we are in war, and cannot be certain that our cities may not be bombed. Then, too, our armies and allies need food, and food comes out of the ground. There is some fear, perhaps more widespread than we think, that when the war is over bread lines will again reach down city blocks. And so many a well paid skilled worker may be looking out of the corner of his eye at a patch of land somewhere; for in these days, the land may be man's last hope of survival. Land has always been basic, but nowadays we feel its permanency, know it will remain—even if seared with fire—and will again produce food for man and beast.

In *Forward to the Land*, Elmer T. Peterson, newspaperman of Oklahoma City, correctly points out the weakness in the "back-to-the-land movement," strives heroically to put the horse in front of the cart. He speaks of soilways, shows how they have been seduced and prostituted by moneyways, pleads for man to use his elemental survival sense and learn how to secure a living from nature as do the birds and the wild animals. He praises the sound soilways followed by the FSA in its development of small farmsteads, laments the mixing of moneyways and soilways as when the crop control program reduced acreage to raise prices and then sent back from Washington subsidy payments to the farmers.

Author Peterson has shown how urbanism and moneyways have borne down on the land, mining it of fertility and undermining the status of farm people. He has pointed out the need of a land-use policy, wants millions of small landowners, wants many of the families now in cities to move out on small tracts of their own. Obviously afraid of collectives and surely afraid of farm-labor politics, he seems to plead for a forward-to-the-land movement in terms of the nation's yesteryears when individualism paid its own way. The number of small independent farm owners ought to be increased as Peterson says, but one wonders whether the cooperative movement can be developed among them speedily enough for

them to share at all equitably in the use of the nation's goods and services, all of which cost money. Many farmers feel that independence and mere subsistence is not nearly enough. They want an automobile, a telephone, radio, a doctor in case of sickness, and a high school education or more for their children. But Peterson is eternally right in insisting that soilways must be understood and followed, that man must learn the character of the land and of himself and live in harmony with nature's basic rules.

Forward to the Land is a book from the mouths of farm people when a newspaperman, with convictions of his own, interviews them. Peterson thinks that our national agricultural policy from 1914 to 1940 was on a costly detour from solid soil sense, pleads for us to get back on the main road, leave off with industrialized and monetized farming even if farming has been revolutionized by invention and research.

Ladd Haystead's *Farm for Fortune and Vice Versa* is a humorous solid book. He laughs with city people who want to own farms, gives them helpful advice on what to buy if anything, talks about types of soils and how farming activities have to be related to them.

He has the best time of all discussing "specialty crops," which have made a few people rich and bankrupt all the rest. He ends his book with, "Why be a farmer at all?", finds the reason in the fact that some people prefer to work long hours with growing things, rather than to work shorter hours and live more simply. For he makes it unmistakably clear that so long as apartment conveniences are available, apartment life is infinitely more simple than making a living on a farm, whether with the aid of machines or by hand.

As secretary of the New York Farm Corporation and as a consultant who charges a fee, Haystead says he wrote *Farm for Fortune and Vice Versa* to help out a lot of people he wants to help and who can't pay him for his services.

ARTHUR RAPER.

United States Dept. of Agriculture.

The Old South: The Founding of American Civilization. By Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1942. Pp. 364. \$3.50.

Any student of rural society will be interested in this account of the beginnings of the agrarian culture of the old South written by a competent historian. Carrying further the account begun in his *Patrician and Plebian in Virginia* and *Planters of Colonial Virginia*, Wertenbaker studies the different regions from Tidewater to Piedmont and the classes from tobacco aristocrat to urban artisan from Maryland to South Carolina. Much of his attention is devoted to architecture, but he discusses the surviving buildings, public and private, with a vigor and discrimination that is more than antiquarian.

As in most histories of the South's beginnings, the common people seem neglected in comparison with the upper classes who have left most of historical records in Williamsburg and Charleston or elsewhere. That Wertenbaker is no mere apologist for the order he describes is evident in the most impressive chapter in the book—that on the "Good Earth." Here the author shows that the undemocratic system of land grants was second only to the slave system in building up the characteristic economic and social structure of the Old South. Worse than the land policy was the wholesale land-grabbing practiced by the prominent and influential; some failed to stop short of the use of fraudulent deeds and most refused to pay quit-rents to the crown on the land they retained. Both yeomen and indentured servants who had served their time had difficulty in finding land that was not pre-empted by privilege.

Always there are beginnings. The reading of this book can well lead us to agree with the author that "if we are to understand, not only the ante-bellum South with its aristocratic social structure, its courtly gentlemen, its ignorant yeomen, its fine mansions and crude huts, but the New South of today, we must turn back to colonial days."

RUPERT B. VANCE.

University of North Carolina.

Blue Ridge Country. By Jean Thomas. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, Inc., 1942. Pp. x + 338. \$3.00.

Possum Trot. By Herman Clarence Nixon. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941. Pp. xii + 192. \$2.50.

Here are two word portraits of transitional areas in the rural South by native authors. To Thomas the *Blue Ridge Country* is its own excuse for being and needs no extenuation. Her story is mainly about what has been and what is happening in the Blue Ridge Country. Nixon's *Possum Trot* is a decadent local neighborhood which typifies the whole South, and one which needs to be saved from complete ruin.

The Blue Ridge folk have graduated slowly from hard liquor to Coca Cola and from log rollings to C.C.C. camps. Mechanical inventions have obliterated the barriers which once separated mountain and plain. Tradition and superstition have bowed to education. The embers of old feuds have cooled and the sons of the McCoys and the daughters of the Hatfields are being joined peaceably in wedlock. Sergeant Alvin York and O. O. McIntyre have become antitypes of the James boys. As the mule has deferred to the tractor so has the primitive Baptist acceded to the modern organ playing Baptist.

Possum Trot presents a more bedraggled spectacle. Share cropping, debt, extra-regional economic exploitation, political demagogery, and an obsolescent economy have brought disorganization. No longer are the preachers fed fried chicken during August. The people are not interested in ways of cheating Hell. They have other worries. The Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians have all but surrendered to Pentecostals, three hundred of whom are barely able to raise a miserable four dollars with which to pay the preacher for a revival meeting because there is no more to give. In *Possum Trot*, the Negro has suffered as well as the white man from the impersonal forces of social disruption.

Nixon thinks change has brought misery to *Possum Trot* and the whole South. Thomas sees change as the arrival of Spring in

the mountains. With unexplained inconsistency, Nixon thinks change again will be the way out, but it will be painful. The South is ready to gain from the spreading movement in industry. Here, the paths of the two writers converge, for Thomas, too, sees in the T.V.A. and other industrial evidences of man's genius the horizon of a new and better era in the South.

As contributions to rural sociology, the values of such books as these is relatively small. They suggest hypotheses from which analytical studies might be projected. That is about all. Even so, the chief fault one may find in them is the illogical conclusion of both authors that for the South to escape the ills of agrarianism it must embrace the vices of industrialism.

OTIS DURANT DUNCAN.

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Desert Saints: The Mormon Frontier in Utah. By Nels Anderson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1942. Pp. xx + 459. \$4.00.

Here is a book that should attract the attention of laymen and professionals alike, for it is on a topic that has proved perpetually interesting to American readers, and it is written in a manner that is both pleasing and objective. It successfully avoids either "taking sides" or exaggerating the sensational for the sake of morbid appeal. Yet it is open, frank, and honest. It is neither "pro" nor "anti," and it is both sympathetic and critical at the same time. Such a realistic approach to Mormon history and culture is welcome; and because of it, *Desert Saints* is as fascinating and gripping as fiction—or even more so.

Nels Anderson writes from the point of view of a participant observer and a scholar. He went to Utah in 1908, joined the Mormon Church in 1909, and then lived among the "saints" for more than ten years following. This early experience, plus his more recent professional training as a sociologist have prepared him well for the task of interpreting this great social and religious movement. But it is evident that the insights he acquired through participation have been

added to and multiplied considerably by study and research. The book is well documented. The sources referred to consist frequently of unpublished original church records and diaries to which the author had access. As a matter of fact, one of the most delightful and refreshing things about his entire treatment is his frequent use of previously unused material.

The book treats Mormon history, with emphasis on the Utah period. The first two chapters provide a brief but authentic sketch of the early beginnings and struggles of the church; which are followed by ten chapters dealing with the trek westward and the development of community life in Utah up to about 1900; and finally there are four chapters on the special topics of priesthood government, communistic living, polygamy, and a survey of the Mormon way of life. But the author is more interested in the social implications and interpretations of history than he is in the mere chronology of events, and for this reason his book is as much sociology as it is history. The social forces or causes back of religious persecution and the people's reaction to it, reasons for the practice and the final abandonment of polygamy, factors in the struggle for adaptation to a desert environment; these and other problems are treated in an enlightening manner, supported by both statistical and case study materials. Rural sociologists will be especially interested in the development of the ecological and social patterns of the Utah "farm village."

There are a few technical errors such as on the thirty-first line of page 182 where the word "with" is repeated unnecessarily; on the thirtieth line of page 197 where "1878" is given instead of "1858"; and on the thirty-first line of page 385 where "In" is given instead of "It." But these are exceptional.

On the whole the book is well written as to both style and mechanical detail, and it is based upon sources that are authentic and reliable. It has no axe to grind. It is analytic rather than dogmatic; and because of this, it stands as a real contribution to the literature of the sociology of religion.

HAROLD CHRISTENSEN.

Brigham Young University.

A Little Lower Than the Angels. By Virginia Sorensen. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1942. Pp. 427. \$2.75.

And Never Yield. By Elinor Pryor. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. 520. \$2.75.

Both of these historical novels deal with the inception of polygyny into the Mormon community of Nauvoo, Illinois, about a century ago. The principal characters and the personal incidents are fictitious but the Mormon leaders and the major historical situations are authentic. In both books the plot centers about the emotional stresses and the disjunctions in family life created by the presence of a second wife. The first wife, in both novels, was not a devout Mormon but was intensely in love with her husband, who accepted literally and with great faith all the revelations reported by Joseph Smith, the founder and leader of the church. Similarly, in both stories the first wife tolerated the hardships of frontier life, the tragic persecutions meted out by "Gentiles," and the fanatical devotion of her husband to Joseph Smith largely because of her unbounded love for her spouse. When she was obliged to permit the marriage of her husband to a second wife the results were disastrous to family life. The second wife in both situations was extremely religious, a hard worker, cooperative, personable, and the emotional and intellectual counterpart of wife number one.

Although alike in plot and historical setting, the two books are different in literary style and interpretative content. *A Little Lower Than the Angels* portrays the reactions of the members of the Simon Baker family and of others in the community to plural marriage. The second wife was urged upon Simon Baker at a time when the first was physically unable to care for her six children. Despite the personal qualities of "Aunt Charlotte" the older children would not accept her as a member of the family. Mercy Baker, the first wife, did not recover from her physical ailment and the emotional strain made her increasingly psychopathic. She died soon after the family started its forced migration from Nauvoo as the city

burned from fires started by the Gentiles. In a remarkably effective literary style Mrs. Sorensen relates the salient features of the "total situation." When each major event occurs the reader knows something of the cultural setting, the antecedent conditioning of the characters and the unique aspects of the situation. Moreover, the main psychological mechanisms and the organic factors in operation are implicit if not actually described.

And Never Yield is essentially a romantic novel with an historical setting. The story is focused upon Linsey Allen Wells, the events being described in terms of the manner in which they affected her. The romance with Nathan Wells blossomed at the massacre of Haun's Mill, Missouri, where her father and mother were killed; it led to marriage during the siege of Far West, Missouri, and it matured through a series of extraordinary circumstances. She was a disbeliever in Mormonism and resented her husband's uncompromising adherence to the tenets of the church. Only after insistent urging by church officials, and with the consent of Linsey, Nathan took a second wife. Linsey made a desperate effort to rationalize her position and tried to conceal her indignation by helping plan the marriage. Linsey admired and respected Ruth who had many qualities which she herself lacked. But she could not abide sharing her husband and was on the verge of deserting him when another crisis, the murder of Joseph Smith, drew her back to Nathan. In this book historical incidents are interestingly woven into the love story and the reader learns much about the Mormons of Nauvoo.

Of the two books *A Little Lower Than the Angels* is a more adequate portrayal of the sociological milieu into which polygyny was born.

HOWARD R. COTTAM.

Pennsylvania State College.

Democracy's College, The Land-Grant Movement in the Formative Stage. By Earle D. Ross. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1942. Pp. 266.

This work by a historian is, as its sub-

title indicates, a history of the Land-Grant College Movement during its formative stage, up to 1890. The first part carefully places the Land-Grant College Movement in its setting. The latter half deals with the struggles of the various states to organize colleges and find presidents, faculties and students for them. Each problem presented major difficulties.

This new college was, however, influential in its own way. "Quite aside from the sort of training it provided, the separate A. and M. colleges reached a stratum of students for whom higher or even intermediate training would not otherwise have been available. Entrance requirements, charges, courses of study, and social informality and equality all represented adjustments to mass requirements such as no collegiate system in this country or any other had witnessed."

The book is interestingly written and extensively documented. Forty-six pages are given to documentation and twenty-three pages to bibliography. Sociologists will find in it basic data for the analysis of forces operating in the origin and development of a social movement.

PAUL H. LANDIS.

The State College of Washington.

The Country School. By Iman Elsie Schatzmann. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1942. Pp. xvi + 233. \$1.50.

This book by the executive secretary of the Committee on Rural Education is the report of personal observations made by the author in the countries of Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Iceland, England, Italy and the United States. Her description of rural schools in these countries are given appropriate settings against the historical backgrounds, and contemporary cultural milieu in which they function. Her own observations are checked by interviews with teachers and school authorities, and by reference to published authoritative data.

Competence in the use of many languages, as well as in the field of education, qualified the author admirably for the kind of job she undertook to do. Valuable material is presented on the training of teachers, sal-

aries paid, their living conditions, methods of instruction, organization, and administration of schools of various types, as well as descriptions of the physical plant, its conveniences and inconveniences, and the attention which is given to the physical comfort and welfare of the pupils.

The story of Rose Dill, a contemporary "Brown Mouse," as told in the next to the final section of the book, is worth the price of the book.

A selected bibliography for each country is a valuable supplement.

LOWRY NELSON.

University of Minnesota.

Case Studies of Consumer Cooperatives. By H. Haines Turner. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. 330. \$2.50.

This is the first detailed study of specific American consumer cooperatives. It is based on careful field investigation in Massachusetts and the three north-central states of Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. Unfortunately the study is limited to stores founded by Finnish-Americans. This, however, produces some interesting data as to the social problems arising as second and third generation Finns came to maturity and sought to bring more and more persons of other racial groups into the membership. This is a familiar story in its outline. Foreign language churches and other institutions have faced similar difficulties. These cooperatives, about one hundred societies, have not made a complete adaptation as yet but progress is clearly shown and there can be little doubt as to the end of the story.

These cooperatives undersold chain stores by about 5 per cent, the independents by about 10 per cent. Patronage dividends of 2 to 3 per cent further cut the cost of living for members. Despite this they paid slightly better wages than their competitors. Taking 1929 as one hundred, the index of sales of the cooperatives dropped to sixty-four at the bottom of the depression against fifty-one for sales of all retailers, including the "coops." By 1938 these indices stood at 138 and 72 respectively. During the depression

a few coop stores failed, but the record in the depression was markedly superior to the record of private retail stores even in good years.

One of the interesting chapters of the book is Dr. Turner's analysis of the reasons for the superior achievement of the cooperative societies. He concludes that education, owner-customer direction and a number of other causes chiefly social in their nature offer the explanation.

Interestingly enough the rural cooperative-stores made a better record than their urban counterparts, although even the urban societies showed a clear-cut superiority on the points noted above over private stores.

EDMUND DES. BRUNNER.

Columbia University.

The Field of Social Work. By Arthur E. Fink. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1942. Pp. x + 518. \$3.00.

Arthur Fink's book, *The Field of Social Work*, is a valuable contribution to the social work literature. It was prepared for pre-professional social work students, beginning social workers, lay persons, and agency board members. The book is divided into ten chapters which include such subjects as the development of social work, family welfare work, child welfare services, the child guidance clinic, visiting teacher work, the court, probation and parole, medical social work, public welfare and public assistance, social group work, and community organization.

The material in each chapter was read and evaluated by able and competent social workers, and the author recognized some of the limitations of his volume such as the omission of certain areas of social work and the disproportionate amount of attention given to the discussion of family case work. However, the author did not realize perhaps that his book, in some instances, was too technical for the groups for whom it was written. For example, there was considerable material on intensive case therapy in the chapter entitled, "The Court, Probation and Parole," and there were occasional dis-

cussion of the "heavy analytical side" of case problems. It was believed also that some of the case summaries were too difficult for the groups for whom the material was prepared.

The book was condensed as much as possible, in fact, it might easily have been expanded into two volumes in as much as certain fields of social work were omitted, and such areas as community chests, councils of social agencies, the Federal Social Security Act, etc., were dismissed with a few pages of discussion. Even more important, too little attention was given to the discussion of the public social services so that there was an unrealistic picture of the relationship between the public and private fields of social work.

In those fields of social work which were given thorough coverage it was evident that the author had done much recent research and had included the latest developments. The book was relatively free of errors but if one wished to quibble one could call attention to the fact that there was some confusion of English almshouses with workhouses, that the first mental hospital in Virginia was established in 1769 and not 1772, and that Secretary J. V. N. Yates, not Tate, prepared the almshouse report for the New York state legislature in 1824.

For class use, the volume would have been more valuable if footnotes had been added so that students would have an opportunity to examine the original source materials. However, one of its excellent features was the very good bibliography which was extensive and included the most recent of references.

E. M. SUNLEY.

West Virginia University.

New Hampshire Borns a Town. By Marion Nicholl Rawson. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1942. 319 pp. \$3.50.

Mrs. Rawson's latest contribution to *Americana*, a field in which she has distinguished herself and won many admirers with the publication of no less than a dozen titles, is the story of The Town's first hundred years of life, from 1763 to 1863. The

Town happens to have been located in New Hampshire, on the western edge of the Granite State, back a little from the banks of the Connecticut, and not far north of the Massachusetts line. But, as the author views it through the medium of the miraculously surviving records and legends of those hundred years, it becomes more than a single small town of New Hampshire; under her care its tale widens into the tale of the state, and then, pushing across the adventitious lines that delineate the boundaries of the state, the history of all of New England's early settled, isolated towns. "The story," so the introduction informs one, "might have been written of any one of several of the neighbors which cluster round The Town's bounds, and been entirely true in its basic, founding facts, but one must write of what he knows and so the choice has been narrowed down and the cart-ruts followed over but one of them which for convenience we shall call simply—The Town." It is abundantly evident in what follows that Mrs. Rawson is writing of a familiar and beloved piece of New England.

Aging leather record books, hand-written and hand-sewn, dating back in an almost unbroken series to the early 1760's (fortunately time and fire and man have been tender with the witnesses of this community's past), bearing the crudely lettered observations of generations of Proprietors, and Clergy, Select Men and Vigilantes, Librarians and Militiamen, furnish the raw material of the tale. From them and supplementary diaries, account books, and letters, is drawn the picture of The Town and the Town's people in their first critical century—a well-rounded, complete portrait, considering the fragmentary nature of such evidence.

The reader first traces The Town's development from the abortive attempt at settlement in the summer of 1753, through its second chartering by the royal Governor to certain Town Proprietors ten years later (these worthies, as was the custom, exercised their haphazard promotional talents—and likewise drew their rewards—from a

distance, leaving to humbler and stouter adventurers, the Druces, the Cadys, the Bakers, the Warners, the Waits, the real task of pioneering). One watches them clear and break the land and then, that accomplished and life a little secured, sees them through their first Town Meeting, in 1766. Since with the early settlers first things came first, it was officials, roads and a burying ground that occupied their attention at that meeting; only later, in 1770, did they turn their minds toward a Meeting-house and a minister, taxes to pay for them, and rules regarding the punishment of sinners and the 'sprinkling' of new born babes.

In this fashion Mrs. Rawson describes The Town and its course, with rich detail drawn from her documents and interpreted in the light of her own antiquarian knowledge. One is introduced to the families that made The Town, acquainted with their early struggles with fire and pestilence, their war against red man and Red Coat; the economy of The Town is traced from rude scratching of the soil to flourishing agricultural-industrial maturity. The homes of the men and women of The Town; the intimate facts of birth and marriage and death; their politics, schisms, and factions; their recreation, schooling, and strivings towards culture; their few sins and their many virtues; the few withered twigs and the many sound boughs of their genealogical trees, all are exposed to view.

This is a book that will attract the antiquarian more than the sociologist, the genealogist more than the historian of culture. It contains a wealth of information; it is an authentic piece of scholarship; but it lacks conceptual framework. If to Mrs. Rawson's admirable sources, her dogged determination, and rich experience could be added the training of the student of culture, we should have here a fine addition to our inadequate knowledge of the antecedents of the problems of our rural communities. As it is, we find it only another piece of local history—superior local history, it is true, but hardly to be classed as a definite study of the origins and development of the small New England town.

As for style, some may well feel with the author of an ironic piece on book-titles that appeared in *The New Yorker* a few weeks ago, that Mrs. Rawson's deserves the distinction of being "the most revoltingly colloquial" of the year. If so, I will warn them to go no further than the front cover, for the author is exceedingly fond of the folk-speech and uses it freely, sometimes to the detriment of clarity. That, and a predilection for coy 'asides' to the reader tend to mar an otherwise delightful piece of work.

MASON T. RECORD.

University of New Hampshire.

A History of Poor Relief Legislation and Administration in Missouri. By Fern Boan, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941. Pp. xiv + 243. \$1.50.

This planographed volume constitutes one of the series of state Poor Law studies being made under the auspices of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago. It is a careful piece of work, well documented. The chief topics considered are local outdoor relief, almshouses, special dependent classes and public assistance programs. A chapter on judicial interpretation reveals the powerful position of the courts in the development of the present system of poor relief.

The author traces the evolution of the present complicated system of public assistance from the territorial laws providing for complete responsibility of local governmental units. She concludes that the 1940 programs differ from the early programs in the unit of financing and in the provisions concerning type of assistance given. Dependent categories, however, are "new only in the terminology of social workers."

C. E. LIVELY.

University of Missouri.

The I. L. O. and Reconstruction. By Edward J. Phelan. Montreal: International Labour Office, 1941. Pp. 112. \$0.50.

Wartime Developments in Government-Employer-Worker Collaboration. Montreal: International Labour Office, 1941. Pp. xi + 152. \$1.00.

The I. L. O. and Reconstruction was prepared by Mr. Phelan, the Acting Director of I. L. O., as his report to the Conference of the International Labour Organization held in New York in October, 1941. The report covers the activities of I. L. O. since the 1939 meeting in Geneva; including a review of the political, economic and social repercussions of the war; the adjustments of the I. L. O. to new conditions (involving among other things the removal of the office from Geneva to Montreal), and an outline of the future policy of the organization. In this latter connection Mr. Phelan says:

This then can be taken as the starting point, that future policy is to be directed to ensuring for the individual not only an improvement in conditions of labour but economic security without which, it is now recognized, there can be no fully effective implementation of social justice. (92)

There is a brief review of developments in the field of agriculture (61-64).

Wartime Developments is a report growing out of the New York I. L. O. Conference dealing with the development of collaboration among employers, workers and government, in the countries of Great Britain, Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, Union of South Africa and the United States. Discussion centers around *collaboration* on five fronts: (1) central administrative machinery; (2) conditions of employment; (3) particular industries; (4) the social field; and (5) post-war reconstruction.

One cannot read these reports against the background of the present crisis without a consciousness of the vitality of democracy and faith in the potentiality of international cooperation to promote the cause of human welfare.

LOWRY NELSON.

University of Minnesota.

An Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina. By Frank J. Klingberg. Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, 1941. Pp. 180. \$2.00.

Color, Class, and Personality. By Robert L. Sutherland. Washington, D. C.: Amer-

ican Council on Education, 1942. Pp. 135. \$1.25 cloth, \$.75 paper.

Klingberg's historical monograph is presented as "a study in Americanization." It is an appraisal of the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts as this British organization sought to Christianize and educate the Negro slaves in the colony of South Carolina. Heavily weighted with quotations from primary sources, chiefly official records of the S.P.G., the book throws light on many aspects of a social structure "dominated more by rice than by righteousness."

Illustrative of how a social institution must function within the limits of the general societal framework is the description of the Society's Negro school at Charleston designed to educate Negro teachers. The procedure of buying two Negro males in their early teens so as to prepare them to be teachers in the school is noteworthy as an early recognition of the inherent abilities of the race. Maintaining that "a race, like a nation, measures its expectancies of the future by its achievements in the past" (p. 139), the author concludes: "The S.P.G., as the original interventionist in South Carolina in the eighteenth century, uncovered all the problems of race relationships between the white men and the Negro that have appeared at any time since." (p. 123).

It is interesting to make the approximately 175 years jump in time between the period covered in Klingberg's study and the setting of Sutherland's volume on current personality development of Negro youth in America. Striking indications of social change are evident in the materials of these two contrasting Negro studies. But at the same time there are indications equally striking that basic problems of societal relationships are the same.

Sutherland's brief volume summarizes the chief findings of the Negro Youth Survey of the American Youth Commission in which six studies have previously appeared. Implications for our national life are stressed. With the situation of minority groups here at home presenting a stiff challenge to our

efforts to restore democracy abroad, the timeliness of the book is evident. In studying the personality development of Negro youth in country and city, South and North, a number of research methods were used varying from detailed socio-psychiatric case studies to quantitative tests and ecological and cultural analyses of the social structure setting.

Part I presents a picture of "Things as They Are," while Part II offers concrete suggestions of "Changes to Be Made," giving special attention to needed changes in stereotypes, lower-class standards, and Negro education, social work and religion. This is an admirable summary, popularly written, of an important survey in the fields of youth and race relations.

GORDON W. BLACKWELL.

University of North Carolina.

Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages. By Edith Cooperrider Rodgers. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. 147. \$1.50.

This is a study of the more solemn feasts of the Church between the years 1200 and 1520. The term "holidays" is applied to these particular feast days in the title, but the terms "holy days" and "holidays" are used indiscriminately in the text. It is true that in the Middle Ages these so-called holy days and holidays were identical. But today, at any rate in this country, this is by no means universally the case. Here we speak, for example, of national or legal holidays, such as Washington's Birthday and Decoration Day; but we speak of ecclesiastical holy days such as the Feasts of All Saints and the Circumcision of Our Lord. More accurately still, the term that is used today, in the case of the church feasts in question, is "holy days of obligation." This sets off more clearly these particular feast days from lesser religious feasts of the church. It refers only to those days, on which, besides Sundays, the faithful are obliged to assist at Mass and to refrain from unnecessary servile work.

At the opening of the period considered by Dr. Rodgers there were forty of these holy days of obligation. In some dioceses, where special local feasts were observed, the number ran even higher. Some of the clergy and laity thought there were too many. Work was interfered with too much, they said. These urged the number be cut down. Others again objected to the abolition of any of the feasts that had been established. In 1642, Pope Urban XIII decreed the observance of 36 feasts. That was but a slight diminution of the number. To this day all pastors must offer Mass for the members of their congregations on these 36 days, as well as on all the Sundays of the year. In spite of the foregoing ruling of Pope Urban XIII for the universal church, there were dioceses in which holy days and Sundays amounted to over 100, not counting feasts of particular monasteries and churches, even down to the eighteenth century.

Today there are ten such feasts for the universal church. Certain countries are exempt from the observance of even some of these. Only six are "holy days of obligation" in the United States. And as is well known, even these six cannot be observed to the full by large numbers, particularly of urban workers. It is much more difficult to observe such holy days in our complex industrial civilization today than it was to observe them in the simpler rural and village civilization of earlier times. This fact, rather than any indifference about observance, or abuses to which Dr. Rodgers calls attention, constitutes the chief reason why over the past few centuries the number of these feasts has been much lessened by the Church.

Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages shows the work of the accurate historian. More information about the manner in which the holy days were observed, both from the religious and social or recreational viewpoint, would undoubtedly have added much interest to the volume. But this may not have been within the province of the author.

EDGAR SCHMIEDELER.

Catholic University of America.

The Economic Life of Primitive Peoples. By Melville J. Herskovits. New York, London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1940. Pp. xii + 492.

As the author mentions in the introductory part of his book (under the title "Anthropology and Economics" published in the January 1940 issue of the *Journal of Social Philosophy*), no other social sciences had fewer contacts than economics and anthropology. This was in the main part to blame on economists, who restricted their work to the analysis of the contemporary economic order. Even today economists have not found satisfactory explanations of the origins and original forms of most of the economic institutions. It would be of an unusual interest and importance to trace and explain the origin of money, ownership, division of labor. The explanations we have so far, in economics, are far from being serious and meaningful. There is a field where economic science, if it does not want to transform itself into a body of pure abstractions, has to borrow very much from anthropology, ethnology and sociology.

Social anthropology, if we can call it such, has so far made very valuable contributions toward the understanding of the origins of our society. Writings of Boas, Forde, Morgan, Lowie, Kroeber, Malinowski, Hrdlicka, Firth and some others should be mentioned in the first place. Lowie's *Primitive Society* (1920) and *Introduction to Cultural Anthropology* (1934) and Forde's *Habitat, Economy and Society* (1934) are examples of work that should be encouraged by all means. Anthropology has for a long time paid more attention to the physical characteristics of man (physical anthropology) than to his social and cultural relations and institutions.

Professor Herskovits' *Economic Life of Primitive Peoples* is the first systematic presentation of what could be called "economic anthropology." In his work on American Negroes, Herskovits revealed himself as an able sociologist, but we have to make an objection as to his "economics." Without going into details, we regret that Herskovits had to read Fetter, Robbins and similar

economists, and thereby sometimes force conventional economic concepts upon his anthropological material. This remark applies particularly to some central parts of his book, notably the sections on trade, capital formation, and economic surplus.

There is nothing much we can say about the book in detail. It is excellently written and deserves to be read by every serious sociologist and economist. To economists especially, it will be useful in making them widen their views. To sociologists it will present a wealth of social fact-materials as they appear in the primitive and undifferentiated society. Social anthropology is in a way, a discipline complementary to sociology.

The book is divided into a number of sections, each covering a special form or aspect of economic life, such as: trade, barter, division of labor, business enterprise, money, consumption, capital formation, land tenure, etc. One would wish that Herskovits or someone else would proceed with the work on the origin and original forms of economic institutions, in restricted fields and in detail. Materials so far assembled by anthropologists, geographers and ethnologists can provide a good beginning.

NICHOLAS MIRKOWICH.

University of California.

American Society and the Changing World.

By C. H. Pegg et al. New York: F. S. Crofts & Company, 1942. Pp. xiii + 601. \$3.50.

Vauxhall Gardens. By James Granville Southworth. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. viii + 199. \$2.75.

American Society and the Changing World was written by several members of the departments of History, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology at the University of North Carolina. The book, designed to be used as a textbook in social science, "attempts to view American society and its problems as a part of a dynamic interdependent world now in the throes of swift transition." There are two main parts of

the work: (1) the Changing World, and (2) the United States and Its Problems. In Part One, various social, economic, and political features and problems of several foreign countries are analyzed and described. Part Two contains nineteen chapters on the United States.

Rural Sociologists will find the sections dealing with the conservation of resources, agriculture, family and youth, and population especially useful in giving a general picture of conditions and problems in the social science field existing in the United States. In addition, the chapters dealing with conditions in foreign countries will prove useful to students seeking general information and understanding of basic social, economic and political problems of international import. The authors of this book make no claim for presenting a blueprint for social reconstruction, but rather seek to analyze and describe.

This work, written by a staff of men who have had much experience in their respective fields, should prove most helpful to the beginning student of social science. He will find in it a series of challenging problems whose complexity he will be much more able to appreciate and whose solution he will be able more adequately to attempt.

Vauxhall Gardens is a history and description of the gardens of that name. It was here that great English writers such as Pepys, Swift, Addison, and others spent much of their time. The chief significance of the work is that it gives a picture of the way in which certain classes of Englishmen derived their entertainment and amusement from the "time of the Restoration to the very height of Victorianism."

REED H. BRADFORD.

West Virginia University.

Climate and Man, Yearbook of Agriculture, 1941. Edited by Gove Hambidge. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1941. Pp. 1248. \$1.75.

Sixth in a series intended to serve as a set of reference volumes for modern farmers, this volume deals with one more all-

important subject to farm people. Previous volumes have dealt with better plants and animals, soils, social and economic conditions affecting the farmer. This one considers climate and man.

The editor's summary compresses within the space of 64 pages some 600 pages dealing with climate as a world influence, as a main factor in agricultural sentiment, as it affects the farmer, and as a subject of scientific study. Part Five composes the last half of the volume, and sets forth detailed climatic data for the United States and for the individual states.

Part One deals with climatic change through the ages; with the related patterns of climate, vegetation, and soils; and includes a brief description of the weather service of the government—what it does, how it works, and how the farmer can make the best use of its activities. The editor makes the pertinent remark in his introduction of this part of the book that "it will be news to many people that man, during his geologically brief existence on earth, has never known a 'normal' climate." He goes on to point out that we are now at the tail end of an ice age and living in a period of climatic violence as great as any the earth has known. The section entitled "Climate and the World Pattern" makes a useful reference for introductory courses in the social sciences.

A section on the how and why of weather knowledge contains brief but excellent discussions of the polar-front theory in meteorology and air-mass analysis. A description of the field organization of the Weather Bureau and of the instruments and procedures that contribute to making the daily weather analysis shows some of the down-to-earth aspects of the science of meteorology.

To one interested in the history of an expanding economy, Part Two will be attractive. Here the story of climate and the settlement of humid and dry regions, of polar and tropical lands is told. The reader gets the feel of life in the tropics and finds many practical suggestions about how to maintain health in heat and humidity. Like-

wise, one cannot read Stefansson's article on "The Colonization of Northern Lands" without catching some of his enthusiasm for life on the ice floes and on the tundra plains of the north. Stefansson warns of sharp-billed insects in hot Alaskan mid-summer days, but he urges the reader to look forward to the "long, clean, clear winter—the time of free movement and varied activity."

Part Three is addressed to farmers. The 262 pages cover an immense amount of materials relating to climate and corn, cotton, tobacco, small grains, vegetable crops, fruits and nuts, forage, grazing lands, and forests. Plant and animal diseases are discussed as affected by climatic conditions and weather. The first section discusses the basic questions of climatic factors and soil formation, describes the principal soil types, and soil productivity. It ends with several pages on the farm as a unit. This brings the part on climate and the farm down to the individual farmer. "There is no such thing as a 'best' use for any combination of soil and climate in the abstract. . . . for many soils there are 10 or even 20 'best' uses, depending upon the other factors in the combination—soil, climate, and farmer." A brief article immediately follows the discussion of climate and soils. This compresses within 15 pages a wealth of facts regarding the influences of temperature, water, and light upon plant growth. Here the farmer finds an excellent survey of the fundamentals that govern plant production. The great bulk of Part Three is occupied with the influence of climate and weather on the growth of individual crops. From the farmer's point of view, these crop by crop discussions are probably the most practical part of the Yearbook.

The core of the Yearbook is Part Four, containing only 130 pages, but given over to a description of the scientific approach to weather and climate. Here are such subtitles as the "Hydrologic Cycle," "Air Mass," and "Evaporation and Transpiration." The author of the section on modern meteorology, Mr. C. G. Rossby, has done a good job of writing for the ordinary reader.

To make a simple description of the atmosphere in motion, disturbed by contact with the surface of the earth—rough and rotating as it is—and subject to strong thermal influences, is practically impossible; yet with care one can follow the discussion and catch a glimpse of the gigantic movements that produce our weather and give each zone its characteristic climate. The section entitled "How the Daily Forecast is Made" by Mitchell and Wexler is exceedingly interesting, but must be read carefully with frequent reference to the maps and charts that are included if the procedure is to be followed. A brief section on amateur forecasting from cloud formations, also by Mr. Rossby, with photographs of clouds—cumulus, cirrus, stratus, nimbus—brings this interesting and important part of the Yearbook to a close.

Part Five gives climatic data for the world in general, the United States as a whole, and for each of 42 states and New England. Data for Maryland and Delaware are combined.

On the whole, the reviewer carries away the impression that the scientific study of climate has taken on new vigor and a vastly enlarged sense of responsibility to society.

E. D. TETREAU.

University of Arizona.

Social and Cultural Dynamics. Volume Four: Basic Problems, Principles, and Methods. By Pitirim A. Sorokin. New York: American Book Company, 1941. Pp. xv + 804. \$6.00.

Social and Cultural Dynamics initiated a new phase in the work of Sorokin, a return to that tradition among the classic masters of social theory which led to the identification of sociology with philosophy of history. To understand and to interpret the trends and causes of social change will always be one of the legitimate aims of sociological theory.

This last volume of Sorokin's work contains three strata of thought: criticism and refutation of other theories, general rules relating to cultural and social processes, and the formulation of a new theory of socio-

cultural change which includes a forecast for the Western world.

The critical parts suffer foremost from Sorokin's neglect to see theories in their historical and intentional relations to one another—as a conversation of minds through the course of time. His preference for a systematic approach leads to subsumption of theories under the same systematic category which may have one formal characteristic in common, regardless of fundamental differences in their content (e.g., the "dichotomic" theories). The validity of the critical discussions is further impaired by misunderstanding of many of the ideas attacked, and even by imputation of meanings not intended by their authors. If MacIver defines "cultural" objects as values-as-ends, he does not mean to say, as Sorokin maintains (p. 171), that these (like music) are considered to be "useless." The substitution of this word for "not utilitarian" seems to me an indefensible license. I have found more than one instance where Sorokin's devastating criticism turns out to be nothing but fencing against windmills. Nor are the references free from inaccuracies. It is incorrect that Alfred Weber's *Kulturgeschichte als Kultursoziologie* does not develop his original theory and hardly mentions it. Throughout Weber's book the triad of the social, the cultural, and the civilization process is maintained, although in an unobtrusive way, and Weber refers to it in the appendix. Furthermore, Sorokin does not seem to understand that those who hold that in the sphere of "civilization" a definite progress is objectively perceivable, adopt the increasing control over nature as the standard, while neither quantitative accumulation of inventions nor ethical aspects of their uses enter into the theorem. (p. 185.)

The general rules of socio-cultural and cultural change are stated primarily in terms of quantity, dealing with "directions" of culture currents and their "fluctuations" and with synchronicity of the latter. Consequently, nothing but a body of rather abstract and formal principles could be expected.

However, the main purpose of the work is to verify the conception of fluctuations between three major socio-cultural systems, each of which is characterized by the prevalent idea of truth from which its values and "meanings" are derived. Much valid criticism has been presented against the very concepts of "ideational," "Idealistic" and "sensate" socio-cultural systems, as well as against the methods of determining the rhythm of the fluctuations. Not much can be added to these arguments in a short review.

If sociology is to be the theoretical knowledge of the structure and function and change of social groups and systems, and if this knowledge is to be gained by understanding interpretation and causal explanation of socially relevant human conduct then, we must say, Sorokin's work does not represent a step forward in the development of this science. In his theory, socio-cultural systems are conceived of as self-propelling more or less integrated wholes, which, if transgressing their immanent limitations, must decay like overgrown organisms and undergo a transformation into either one of two other possible systems. How this happens, what role human beings in their social relations and groups play in this pendulous movement does not become clear.

The rather passive role as "bearers," not creators, of cultural systems assigned to groups, makes it difficult to understand the function of concrete categories of people, e.g., the farmers, or the rural nobility, in the development of socio-cultural systems. The principle—to give one illustration—that a current of "raw" or "unfinished" cultural objects flows from the country to the cities, while another current of "finished" cultural objects flows in the opposite direction (p. 21 ff.) seems, in spite of its origin, to be rather "unfinished."

However, we do not mean to say that the entire fourth volume has no bearing on the sociology of rural life. Apart from many factual observations dispersed through the volume which have definite relation to the problems encountered by rural sociologists, the work should be stimulating in epistemo-

logical and methodological respects. The postulate that "culture" and "society" be held conceptually distinct, the emphasis on the "meaning" of cultural objects, in terms of values, as their characteristic which permits one to see them as elements in a system, and finally the very concept of the "super-system" as such, deserve recognition. While we believe that interpretation of

the meaning of cultural objects and of social phenomena in relation to both structure types and trends of social change should have a place in rural sociology, we think that Sorokin's procedure represents a challenge rather than a model.

RUDOLF HEBERLE.

Louisiana State University.

NEWS NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Edited by Robert A. Polson

RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ADDITIONAL LIST OF NEW MEMBERS FOR 1942

(February 1st to July 1st)

Baird, Mae	1230 Amsterdam Ave.	New York City
Cummings, Bertha	63-18th Ave.	Paterson, N. J.
Dawber, Dr. Mark	297-4th Ave.	New York City
Downs, Mrs. J. W.	150-5th Ave.	New York City
Gibboney, Carl N.	3123-7th St., South	Arlington, Va.
Griffith, Ross J.	Butler University	Indianapolis, Ind.
Grigsby, S. Earl (Rejoining)	249 Peachtree St.	Atlanta, Ga.
Hammer, P. G.	9 Shenandoah Rd., R. D. No. 1	Alexandria, Va.
*Henderson, Francis	N. C. State College of Agriculture and Engineering	Raleigh, N. C.
Hsieh, Ching-Sheng	Drew Theological Seminary	Madison, N. J.
Kramm, Elizabeth R.	333 Fulton St.	San Francisco, Calif.
*LaRue, William C.	501 Aycock St.	Raleigh, N. C.
*Lester, Cindy		Dadeville, Ala.
Loughhead, Rev. Harold	25 S. 4th St.	Lewisburg, Pa.
Maris, Paul V.	3166 N. 18th St.	Arlington, Va.
Powers, G. F.		Nineveh, Ind.
Puckett, Newbell N.	Dept. of Sociology, Western Reserve Univ.	Cleveland, Ohio
Shea, John P.	Forest Service, U.S.D.A.	Washington, D. C.
*Spellman, C. L.	Box 982	Wilson, N. C.
*Staley, Mrs. Helen K.	1230 Amsterdam Ave.	New York City
Stauffer, Dr. W. H.		Sugarcreek, Ohio
*Wayland, Sloan R.	Institute for Research in Social Sciences	Chapel Hill, N. C.

* Student members.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY: The Institute of Adult Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, has issued a 26-page pamphlet setting forth a list of suggested studies in Adult Education. Some attention is given to the immediate war situation but there are also a number of studies under the heading of social and educational planning in terms of post-war reconstruction. Various rural studies are proposed including several related to agricultural and home economics extension, the discussion program of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and county planning. One study in the last named area is already under way. Professor Edmund deS. Brunner, in charge of rural sociology at Columbia University, has been made a member of the institute staff to have general oversight of such rural studies as are undertaken.

ANNUAL MEETING: The 1942 annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society will be held in Cleveland, Ohio, December 28-30. The general theme of the meeting will be "Rural America at War." C. E. Lively.

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY: The Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society is to be held in Cleveland during the last week in December, as previously announced. After consultation with representatives of the other social science groups and the Office of Defense Transportation, it has been decided to go ahead with our plans to hold these meetings. Because of the usual congestion in transportation facilities over a weekend, it has been suggested that the meetings might be held December 29-31, rather than December 28-30. This is now being checked with the local hotels as well as with the transportation agencies in Cleveland. With the exception of the possible change in date, however, it is our plan to go ahead with the meetings as originally scheduled.

CONRAD TAEUBER, Sec.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: Elzer D. Treau, Professor of Rural Sociology, reports

recent publications including "Arizona Farm Leases" and "Volume and Characteristics of Migration to Arizona 1930-39," both of which are bulletins, and an article in *Sociology and Social Research* entitled "The Community Status of Agricultural Labor." This article is an abbreviated version of a paper read at Salt Lake City, June, 1941, at the annual meeting of the Western Farm Economics Association. The study of migration to Arizona was done in cooperation with the Division of Farm Population, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Davis McEntire, Varden Fuller, and other members of the Division participating.

Courses in Rural Sociology and Agrarian Movements are offered alternate years in the College of Agriculture with students enrolled coming from the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Agriculture.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY: Lieutenant Charles O. Reynard, Jr., 23, of Hiram, Ohio, was killed April 22, 1942 in the crash of an Army bomber in New Mexico. Lieut. Reynard was a former Graduate student of Dr. Carle C. Zimmerman and a tutor in Sociology at Harvard University. He was born at Hiram, Ohio, January 31, 1919 and lived there until after his graduation from Hiram College in 1939. As part of his graduate work at Harvard University, he participated in a sociological survey of Bath, N. C.

The Editor of the *Hiram College Alumni Broadcaster* writes: "Lieut. Charles O. Reynard, Jr., 23, of Hiram, has made the supreme sacrifice. Not until a blow of this sort strikes home do we understand the full meaning of this war. For Charlie Reynard was not just an ordinary citizen. When he entered the Army Air Corps ten months ago he left behind him a distinguished record in college and graduate school. All those who knew him well, predicted a brilliant career for him in the field of social leadership. His death is a tragedy in more than one sense—for added to the bereavement of his family and friends is an unfathomable loss to the

future of our country. The post-war world will have pitiful need for all the 'Charlie Reynards' it can find."

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: Sociologists were sad to learn of the passing of Mrs. Mignon Quaw Lott, May 23, 1942. Mrs. Lott was the wife of Dr. Elmo H. Lott, head of the sociology department at the Louisiana State University.

At the time of her marriage Mrs. Lott was recreation specialist in Montana and for a number of years afterward she directed recreation programs for Extension Service Camps in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kentucky, Montana and Washington.

Upon coming to Louisiana some twelve years ago Mrs. Lott wrote and assisted local organizations with their programs. The Campus Club, Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, Consumer groups, and Safety for the Home program are only a few of the organizations which she helped.

Those who knew her feel keenly the loss of a real friend.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA: Mr. Robert J. Milliken, formerly research assistant in the Department of Sociology, has accepted an appointment with the Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE: Mr. Edward C. Collins, formerly research assistant in the Department of Rural Sociology, has accepted an appointment with the Gasoline Rationing Unit at Washington, D. C.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION: Dr. Bruce L. Melvin was transferred from the Rent Section of the Office of Price Administration to Dallas, Texas, in February 1942, where he became Regional Consumer Relations Executive in charge of six states—Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana, and Kansas. The work of the Consumer Division concerns itself with the following: 1) explaining to the people the reasons for price control and rationing;

2) assisting families to adjust their living to a war economy characterized by restriction in the quantity of goods; 3) studying the needs of the civilian population under a war economy; 4) evaluating public opinion concerning price control and rationing. The Extension Service and the Colleges of Agriculture cooperate closely with the personnel of the Consumer Division in reaching rural people. Lacking similar channels for reaching non-rural people, the Consumer Division in cooperation with the Office of Civilian Defense organizes committees through which local volunteers are mobilized to carry out the work.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE: Dean H. L. Price and Leland B. Tate have introduced what is believed to be the first Basic Rural Sociology course arranged for freshmen in any college of agriculture. Under an accelerated war-time program three sections of the course were given this summer, and will be repeated during the fall quarter.

Associate Professor C. L. Folse, now on leave of absence, is an infantry officer attached to the Air Corps at Bolling Field, D. C.

Emerson Books, Inc., of New York, have announced the publication of a book by Assistant Professor John Newton Baker entitled, *Sex Education in High Schools*. This is a survey of the experiences of high schools with their courses in sex education.

Researchers W. E. Garnett and Allen Edwards, of the Agricultural Experiment Station, are cooperating with various state agencies in making studies of population pressure and of rural health and nutrition. They have recently completed studies of marginal population, rural youth, and sample Virginia communities.

William H. Roney, research assistant, left recently for Washington to begin service with the Civilian Training Division of the U. S. Army Signal Corps.

W. W. Eure, assistant in rural sociology extension work, is in Army service and stationed at Fort Monroe, Va.

ing
ric-
ing
r a
ion
The
gri-
nel
ral
ch-
Di-
vil-
ugh
to

ean
tro-
asic
ash-
an
ons
and

on
at-
eld,

ave
As-
en-
This
igh
on.
Ed-
Sta-
ate
tion
ion.
of
and

left
vice
the

ogy
sta-